DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 281 254 CS 505 584

AUTHOR Ulrich, Walter, Ed.
TITLE Cross Examination Debate Association National Tournament Booklet of Judges, 1987.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 128p.; Statements of judges at the Annual National Cross Examination Debate Association Tournament (Baton Rouge, LA, April 4-6, 1987). Several pages may not reproduce well because of print size. For a related document, see CS 505 583.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Collected Works - General (020)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Debate; *Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; *Judges; *Persuasive Discourse; *Philosophy; Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS Cross Examination Debate Association

ABSTRACT

The judging philosophy statements of most of the judges at the 1987 National Cross Examination Debate Association Tournament are contained in this booklet. A short form on each judge details how long they have been judging and how many rounds of debate on the topic of the tournament they had previously judged. A longer form asks for information about their judging paradigms, their views on presentation of arguments by the affirmative and negative teams, and the roles of evidence, style, and delivery in their judging decisions. Samples of both forms are included. A list of all judges participating in the tournament is also included, and those judges for whom no judging philosophy statement could be located are indicated. The judging philosophies are presented alphabetically, and each judge addresses at least a subset of the questions on the forms. However, a few of the statements were prepared for other tournaments, and are more general. (SKC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED281254

CROSS EXAMINATION DEBATE ASSOCIATION

NATIONAL TOURNAMENT

BOOKLET OF JUDGES

1987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Edited by Walter Ulrich
Vanderbilt University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Walter Ulrich

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 505 584

CROSS EXAMINATION DEBATE ASSOCIATION
NATIONAL TOURNAMENT
BOOKLET OF JUDGES
1987

April 4-6, 1987
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Edited by Walter Ulrich
Vanderbilt University

This booklet contains the judging philosophy statements of most of the judges at the 1987 National Cross Examination Debate Association Tournament. When statements were unavailable, every attempt was made to locate judging philosophy statements from other tournaments. When that was done, the source of the judging philosophy statement is indicated.

1987 CEDA Judging Philosophy Statement: Short Form

NAME:

SCHOOL:

Years Judging: Rounds judged on this topic:
Debate Experience (circle all that apply):

Debated in High School Debated NDT Debated CEDA
Coached High School Coached NDT Coached CEDA

1. Paradigm. What paradigm (if any) best describes your approach to judging debate? (circle the best answer) A. Skills paradigm
   B. Tabula Rasa
   C. Hypothesis testing
   D. Critic of Argument
   E. Games-playing
   F. Other (please specify) _____

2. In a hypothetical debate round, if the affirmative team gives examples where drug testing is not justified, and the negative gives examples where drug testing is not justified, I would: (Circle the best answer)
   A. Vote Affirmative
   B. Vote Negative
   C. Vote for the team withe the most examples
   D. Vote for the team with the most significant examples
   E. Other/uncertain

On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree), how do you react to the following statements (for all of these questions, assume that there are no theoretical arguments on these positions):

3. The affirmative must only be reasonably topical. _____

4. Presumption is an important issue on this topic. _____

5. I find counterwarrants acceptable. _____

6. Counterintuitive arguments (e.g., growth is bad; totalitarian regimes are good) are acceptable arguments for me. _____

7. Communication skills are more important to me than the substance of the arguments. _____

Other Comments:

Judging Philosophy Statement
1987 CEDA National Tournament

NAME:

SCHOOL:

Years Judging: Rounds judged on this topic:

Please provide a one page statement of your CEDA judging philosophy. In your statement, you may wish to address some of the following issues:

1. Paradigm. What do you feel to be the role of a debate judge in CEDA debate? What paradigm (if any) best describes your approach to judging debate? What implications does this have for arguments in a debate? In the absence of theoretical arguments, what criteria do you use in evaluating debate? How do you react to theoretical arguments in debates?

2. Affirmative. What prima facia requirements (if any) do you impose on an affirmative team? Do you tend to be conservative or liberal on topicality? How do you resolve topicality issues (e.g., do you use the best definition standard or does the affirmative merely have to be reasonably topical)?

3. Negative. How do you react to counter warrants? How do you assign presumption? How much significance must be established to overcome this presumption? How do you react to counter-intuitive arguments (growth is bad, etc.)? How do you feel about conditional arguments?

4. Evidence. What role does evidence play in your decision? Do you require teams to read complete cites in rounds? Do you ever read evidence after rounds? If so, under what circumstances? How do you tend to weigh conflicting evidence? How do you react to evidence on debate theory?

5. Style and Delivery. What is the role of cross-examination in debate? How does delivery influence your judging? What style of debate do you like to observe?

6. Other. What are your likes and dislikes in debate? Is there any additional information about your judging philosophy that might be helpful for debaters? Are there aspects of this specific topic that influence how you evaluate debate?

JUDGES JUDGING AT THE 1987 NATIONAL TOURNAMENT
CROSS EXAMINATION DEBATE ASSOCIATION

**	Sid Alvarez	Southern Illinois University
	Cliff Aucoin	Univ. of Southwestern Louisiana
	Curtis Austin	Florida State University
	Nick Backus	Texas A & M (NDT)
	Ken Bahm	Cornell University
	Tim Baker	Macalester College
**	Christine Bartenen	University of Puget Sound
	Michael Bartanen	Pacific Lutheran University
**	Jan Berman	Stanford University
	David Berube	Trinity University (Texas)
**	Ray Bilbequx	U.C.L.A.
	Jeff Bile	Southern Illinois University
	Roger Biles	Southeastern Oklahoma
	Kari Bitzer	Central State University
	Kevin Boyer	University of Oregon
**	Brian Boydston	U.C.L.A.
	James Brey	Florida State University
	Chuck Brody	Gustavus Adophus (NDT)
	Don Brownlee	CSU-Northridge
	Raymond W. Buchanan	Pepperdine University
	David G. Burns	Indiana University PUI
	Jimi Cantrill	Carroll College
**	Joe Cardot	Abeline Christian University
**	Sarah Carroll	Emerson College
	Beth Carter	LSU (hired)
	Cherie Carter	Univ. of Southwestern Louisiana
**	Adrian Christianson	University of Minnesota
	Russell Church	John Carroll University
	Kathy Clark	Miami University (Ohio)
	Joe Corcoran	California State University-Chico
**	Linda M. Collier	Univ. of Missouri - Kansas City
**	Maria Cooper	Louisiana Tech
	Wanda Coppola	Towson State University
	Mark Crossman	CSU-Northridge
	Earl Croasmun	Findlay College
	Jacques P. DePlois	Pacific U/Willamette U.
	Craig Disbrow	SUNY - Albany
	Mike Dominigue	University of Texas - Arlington
	Craig Dudczak	Syracuse University
**	Morgan Eldred	University of Oklahoma
	Skip Eno	University of Texas - San Antonio
	Billie Walker Etheridge	Univ. of Texas - El Paso
	Dick Finton	Missouri Southern University (NDT)
	Cynthia Flowers	U. of Alabama - Birmingham
	Doug Fraleigh	Sacramento State
	Nancy Fraleigh	Sacremento State

	David Frank	University of Oregon
**	Cecilia Garibay	Loyola University (Chicago)
**	Otilio Garcia	Eastern New Mexico
	Paul Gaske	San Diego State University
	John Gates	San Diego State University
	Ann Gill	Colorado State University
	Mary Gill	University of North Dakota
**	Bob Glenn	Southwest Missouri State
	Julie Graves	University of South Carolina
	Ron Greene	South Carolina/LSU
	Capt. Andrew Grimalda	West Point
	Sherry Hall	Harvard University (NDT)
	James Hallmark	Oklahoma Christian College
	Ralph A. Hamlett	LSU (hired)
**	Barbara Haney-Powell	U. of Missouri - St. Louis
	Edward J. Harris, Jr.	Suffolk University
	Jack Hart	Vanderbilt University
**	Lynn Rawlins Heard	University of Alabama
	Quentin Hebert	Duke University
	Pierre Heidrich	Weber State University (NDT)
	Gary Horn	Ferris State College
	Jack Howe	Cal. St. Univ. - Long Beach
	John E. Humphries	University of Arizona
	Ed Inch	Pacific Lutheran
	Mary Ives	U. of California - Berkeley
**	Melan Jaich	San Francisco State University
	Bruce Jeffrey	Air Force
	Glenda Jenkins	North Carolina - Charlotte
	Scott Jensen	Central Missouri
	Thomas E. Jewell	University of New Mexico
	M. Anway Jones	Sam Houston State University
**	Pam Joraanstad	North Dakota State University
	Douglas Kent	University of New Mexico
	Wayne Kramer	William and Mary College
**	Todd Kuzma	Northern Illinois University
	John E. Lama	Hillsdale College
	Gina Lane	William Jewell College
	Suzanne Larson	Southern Utah State College
	Harold Lawson	Emerson College
	Richard Leeman	Clemson University
	Dick Lesicko	Macalester College
	Todd V. Lewis	Biola University
	Brenda Logue	Towson University
	Frank J. Lower	LSU - Shreveport
	Thomas S. Ludlum	Capital [illegible]iversity
**	James Maddock	Western [illegible]shington University
	Irwin Mallin	Syracuse University
	Craig Manson	Air Force Academy
**	Kirk Marez	U. of California - Berkeley
	Scott Maurer	Univ. of Alabama - Birmingham
**	Joy McClintock	Pensacola JC/U. of W. Fla.
**	Bob McClory	Columbia University
	Vince Meldrum	Arizona State University (NDT)

	Patrick H. Micken	William and Mary College
	Greg Miller	San Diego State University
**	Tom Miller	U.C.L.A.
	Patti Mills	Pepperdine University
	Scott Millsaps	University of Miami (Florida)
	Susan Millsaps	University of Miami (Florida)
**	Nina-Jo Moore	University of Richmond
**	Scott Moore	University of Illinois
	Marc T. Newman	U. of California - Irvine
	Richard O'Dor	Southwestern College (KS)
	Sean Patrick O'Rourke	Whitman College
	Clark Olson	Arizona State (NDT)
**	Marvin Overbee	University of Oklahoma
**	Cary Oswald	Loyola University (LA)
	David Painter	Pensacola JC/U. of West Florida
**	Gene Parker-Eldridge	University of Oklahoma
**	Ralph Partridge	University of Florida
	Dallas Perkins	Harvard University (NDT)
**	Lori Pleskho	Willamette University
	Sharon Porter	Northern Arizona (NDT)
**	Tom Poulton	Florida State University
	Tom Preston	Univ. of Missouri - St. Louis
	Lee H. Reiff	Millsaps College
	Jane Rhinehart	Rockhurst College
**	Nancy Richards	Brigham Young
**	Paul Richards	Brigham Young
	Roberta Richards	Marshall University
	Larry Richardson	Western Washington University
	David Riek	Northern Arizona
	James Roper	Michigan State University
**	Abran Salizar	Eastern New Mexico
**	Steve Schechter	Washburn University
	Edward Schiappa	Kansas State University
	David K. Scott	University of Oklahoma
	B. Christine Shea	Cal Poly, SLO
	Gregg Simerly	Southern Illinois University
**	Don Smith	Southern University (LA)
	Jim Springston	Marist College
	Pamela Stepp	Cornell University
	Glen Strickland	Emporia State University (1984 NDT)
	Don Swanson	Willamette University
**	Bruce Taylor	Loyola University (Chicago)
**	David A. Thomas	University of Richmond
	David Thompson	University of Alabama
**	Joe Tuman	U. of California - Berkeley
**	Clark Olson	Arizona State University
	Walter Ulrich	Vanderbilt University
	Willis M. Watt	Fort Hays State University
	Terry West	Southwest Missouri State
	Mark Whitney	University of Wyoming
	T. C. Winebrenner	Cal Poly,- SLO
	Charles Wilbanks	University of South Carolina
**	Kim Wong	M.I.T.

Mark Woolsey University of California, Irvine

** No judging philosophy statement could be located for this judge; it is possible that this judge may bring along extra copies of his/her philosophy statement to the tournament.

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

Cliff Aucoin

University of Southwestern Louisiana

Years Judgeing: 10 Rounds judged on this topic: 30+

1. Paradigm
   Role of Judge: Scale. Weigh merit, significance, etc. of information provided.
   Paradigm: See above.
   Implication for arguments: Develop the stuff that has or will provide weight.
   Theoretical arguments: Boils down to interpretation which boils down to merit, significance, etc.

2. Affirmative
   Prima Facia requirements: It is not for me to impose any.
   Topicality: I don't count my decisions and I would love to know a definition for "liberal".
   Issue of Topicality: If a case is reasonably topical, I would assume that it will meet some definition that is reasonably standard.

3. Negative
   Counter Warrants: See Paradigm
   Assign presumption: See above
   Counter-Intuitive Arguments: See above
   Conditional arguments: Depends on conditions, then see Paradigm.

4. Evidence
   Role in Decision: See Paradigm
   Complete Cites: I don't require anything. I assume that tradition, courtesy and the opposition may suggest certain parameters.
   Read Evidence: Seldom, usually to clarify interpretation.
   Weigh Evidence: See Paradigm
   Evidence on Debate theory: See Big 1 (little d)

5. Style and Delivery
   Role of Cross-X: Clarification for all who care.
   Delivery: I am a sucker for anyone I can understand.
   Style preferred: You will never catch me in an NDT round.

6. Other
   Likes and Dislikes: A flo I can read two days later.
   Specific aspects of topic that influence: The link between the cup and the bomb is still somewhat difficult for me to follow (but maybe that is because I haven't heard it presented properly).

The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-4021

College of Communication

CURTIS C. AUSTIN

Years Judging: 6 Rounds Judged on this Topic: 20

Kenneth Burke observed that man is the "inventor of the negative" or that the symbolic nature of human beings is such that every symbolic choice implies an opposite choice. Sometimes it is easier to define something by telling one what it is not. I find myself in this category, so:

I am not a tagline pulling churl. Three words blurted out in 1AR and not responded to in 2NR do not constitute a reason for a decision. Neither do arguments which have long existed on the debate circuit and which are alluded to (i.e. inadequately developed) in the round which I am observing. I am a critic of the argumentation I am listening to and if a team does not paint a big picture with a crayon, so that I can understand what they are saying, I do not expect the opposition to understand and respond. It is in this vein that I expect excellent development of positions. Reliable, credible, persuasive evidence is required to develop such a position. A 4X6 card is not necessarily required.

I am not a CEDA Reactionary. I view this activity as content laden. Good speaking skills will be rewarded with speaker points. Speed used as an unnecessary tactic will be punished in speaker points. But decisions in rounds, barring ethical considerations, unusual rudeness, or paradigms adopted in the rounds will result in a decision on issues, and issues alone. This is not interp.

I am not brain dead. Contrary to many circulated reports, I try to think in a round. When debaters ask me to think in a particular way, such as a hypothesis tester or a policy maker, etc. I can and will do so. I will not abandon my role as an educator. So while I may play along with some intellectual games, I am clearly not a tabula rosa judge. If left to my own designs, I will determine who has won which arguments, based upon the evidence and persuasive nature presented, and see if I can fit all of the arguments that the negative has won and the affirmative has won into a story that makes some sense. In plain English, the arguments you win better make sense in the overall picture you present. This should also clue you in that so-called "counter intuitive arguments" require skillful presentation.

I do not like: rude debaters, speed used as a tactic, tag-team cross examination, conditional arguments, crude or foul language, and mean or nasty people.

I do like: The members of my squad which have made my 2 years in Tallahassee very pleasant, my assistants--Jim Brey, Miguel Delao, Tom Poulton, Susan Dye, and Diane Harney. The many people who make forensics a wonderfully rewarding experience.

1987 NDT

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY

Nick Backus
Director of Forensics
9 tournaments

Texas A&M University
4 years coaching

Overview: I will make every effort to vote for what is in the round. If it isn't there (or I don't have it) I won't vote on it. The only exception is when you force me to inject myself. I never like to do this and when your arguments are such that I have little or no choice but to decide independently what you meant in order to make a decision, I am not pleased, and more than likely, you will not be pleased either. If I am not given clear reasons to vote one way or the other, I look for arguments that I like. I do not like many of the arguments being run this year so beware.

Topicality: Always a voting issue and never a reverse voter. I do not mind voting on topicality at all. My problem arises when I am presented with standards and violations as seperate entities. What usually happens is there are two independent debates--one on standards and one on violations--neither having anything to do with the other. I want standards to be run in conjunction with violations--they should work together. As far as which standards and violations, you tell me.

Paradigm: If it's that important, debate it. I really have no preference.

Inherency: I don't think I've heard an inherency argument this year, but if you've got one, I'll vote on it if you win it.

Significance: Have some. Link it to something. Tell me how it weighs against other arguments in the debate.

Cross-examination: Avoid rudeness. Don't expect miracle answers. Don't be abusive. Try to use this for more than prep time.

Counterplans: Fine with me, as long as there aren't lots of them, and as long as there is support for them. I don't like blip counterplans. If you are going to run it, you ought to make some effort at making it credible. I'll listen to any standards on competition and topicality, but you must meet these to some degree. I am particularly open to affirmative competition arguments.

Turnarounds: These are nice little ways to build case significance, but I do not like to vote on them alone. It should be made clear why this thing really is a turnaround. The tag doesn't make it so.

Speed: Does not matter as long as you articulate clearly. If I don't get the argument, it doesn't exist. If I don't get the evidence it doesn't exist. If I call for evidence it is not because I didn't get it the first time. On the contrary, I will only call for evidence that I was able to flow.

NAME: Ken Bahm
SCHOOL: Cornell University
YEARS JUDGING: 3 ROUNDS JUDGED ON THIS TOPIC: 6-8 every weekend.

1. PARADIGM:

I describe myself as a dyed in the wool Tabula Rasa judge. This means that I will consider all arguments made in the round and I will consider only arguments made in the round. I will not dismiss an argument because I think or know that it is unreasonable. I will not do your arguing for you. I feel that debate is most educational when it is open to a wide variety of points of view. For this reason, I do not like to impose my likes, dislikes, and expectations on a debate round. In particular I do not like to impose any paradigm on the debate round, but expect debaters to carry that burden. This usually means arguing criteria throughout the debate. If you don't argue for applied paradigms in the form of criteria and decision rules then you are leaving me free to leap into that broad abstraction called 'critic of argument.' I'd prefer not to. I also feel that debating about the nature of debate is appropriate.

2. IMPLICATIONS:

My answer to the above question also answers a great many of the other questions that Walter Ulrich poses: I do not like to impose my sensibilities on a decision. But since I must admit that I do have PREFERENCES (which influence point-awards), you may as well know them. I tend to most highly prize those elements of debate which distinguish the activity from other speaking contests: teamwork, burden of proof, strategy, and the necessity of clash. I vote on the flow but that does not mean that you should try to avoid persuasion. I like debaters who can take a holistic view of the debate - debaters who can comprehend the forest while at the same time dealing with each and every important tree. I like to hear unique and original positions. I like to see debaters use cross examination as something other than preparation time. I like to see debaters use evidence to support the argument, rather than letting evidence become the argument. Finally, I like a debater who has the ability to think on her feet as a compliment to, rather than a substitute for, sound preparation. As far as my DISLIKES go, I find any form of dishonesty to be inconsistent with the ideals of this event. This means that evidence should be accurate, fully in context, tagged correctly, and not exaggerated when it is pulled and applied. While I have been known to enjoy a fast round, I do tend to dislike debaters who utilize speed for its own sake as well as debaters who use speed as a way of senselessly bludgeoning a team which is obviously less experienced. I also dislike rudeness and debaters who cannot remain calm. I don't like tags without explanation (According to Toulmin they are not arguments, and for this reason I feel justified, even as a Tabula Rasa, in not pulling them). I have a very strong dislike for the presently all too common practice of grouping a disparate cluster of arguments and answering them with an equally disparate cluster of responses. Ninety percent of teams are not on-point enough. Finally I dislike righteous references to the 'rules of debate/CEDA.' Theoretical issues should be justified and debated - not invoked.

3. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

I believe that one great hallmark of CEDA is its variety. I think that a wide variety of styles are and should be acceptable in CEDA. Particular arguments and styles or argument do not weaken and destroy debate. Rather, it is inflexibility and the opinion that one style of debate is 'correct' that threatens the activity.

Tim Baker, Macalester College
2 years coaching

PARADIGM: At the end of the round, I ask myself if the proposition is warranted. On this year's topic, I think that the negative must give me some good reasons for drug testing. A lot of these generic meatballs don't strike me as particularly good reasons for drug testing. Robotics, LDC debt default, and New Age all strike me as rotten reasons for drug testing. Some of these exotic claims might make some sense, but most debaters don't take the time to make the position persuasive to me. I would like to hear rounds where people stick to the middle to the topic rather than trying to link the topic up to something that seems extraneous.

EVIDENCE: There is good evidence and there is bad evidence. Source qualifications are one way of sorting out the two. I think that evidence can be subject to abuse. If you read too much of it too quickly, I won't get much of it down in my mind or on my flow. If your delivery screws up a "damn good card," don't expect me to read it after the round. I get bothered by blurbs as well. A claim that "socialism is inevitable" isn't interesting unless the reasoning is provided as well. I think a lot of teams overclaim their evidence (I know that I used to do it) and people should pick up on that trick more often.

TOPICALITY: If the affirmative establishes that most employers have no business testing most, if not all, of their employees, then the affirmative is topical or justified or whatever you might want to call it. If the affirmative proves something less than this, then I'd guess we are looking at a hasty gen. COUNTERWARRANTS seems to fit in here. I think that the theory probably does describe what negatives should be doing on the proposition. I think that hasty generalization is valid argument because fallacies are supposed to matter in debate. If I have learned one thing from judging NDT, it is that standards are a waste of time. Tell me about the violation and explain why the violation leaves you at a serious disadvantage.

THEORY: Do I think you can run minor repairs or counterplans on this topic? If the affirmative makes some big boo-boo, you might be able to construct a rationale for using these tools to make an impact disappear. Then again, you might not. I'd have to hear the arguments. I don't have a fixed notion about what is good theory and what is bad theory and I test theories by applying them to real problems. I don't like abstract discussions of theory and I am not convinced by people citing debate coaches. I can't even imagine why anyone would talk about theory unless they are solid links to a claim of fairness. I'm pretty sure that unfair theories are bad theories. Some people have been so crude as to point out that I like simple explanations as well. I suspect that that criticism is true. When you go into the ozone, I seldom follow.

EVERYTHING ELSE: Your job is to make sense, be nice, and make my job easy by tying the round up in some pretty package. I am open to persuasion.

MICHAEL D. BARTANEN
Pacific Lutheran University, judging for the University of Puget Sound.
13 years judging. 3 rounds judged on this topic.

A debate judge is not a referee of four students trying to spew out as much information as they can in a short period of time, but a teacher who should be helping them to become more effective advocates in a complex world. Debate ought not be a game but an educational laboratory for students to demonstrate their skills in gathering information; synthesizing it into meaningful arguments; and influencing a listener to accept particular positions.

I prefer debates that: present well-researched positions; that assume that the resolution implies that they ought to debate issues that even their mother would assume are connected to drug testing; are conducted at an intelligible rate of speed; are witty and fun; and do not assume that the listener has spent his life researching the topic in the library.

Quirks I am aware of: I do not vote on topicality but will listen to justification arguments; I strongly dislike debate theory arguments; I strongly prefer complete source citations READ IN THE ROUND; Unsubstantiated evidence challenges will be rewarded with 0 points; I rarely vote on generic arguments; The faster the round the more likely I am to get lost as I have been on sabbatical leave and have not judged much this semester; and rudeness to an opponent, a judge or the activity will result in very low points. I dislike debaters needing oral time signals. I am not a big fan of 'group-discussion c-x.' I try to reward students who dress appropriately to the occasion. I am usually not persuaded by rebuttal speakers who request that I "pull a label."

Best way to get my ballot: Synthesize in rebuttals and tell me how to weigh the issues. Best way to lose my ballot: Not weighing issues in rebuttals and forcing me to figure out who is winning what, in which case I will apply a global perspective influenced by my yuppie-liberal democrat-civil libertarian political beliefs. If that doesn't strike fear into the hearts of every conservative college student I don't know what will!

DAVID M. BERUBE
TRINITY UNIVERSITY
YEARS EXPERIENCE: 11
ROUNDS ON THIS TOPIC: 1

1. PARADIGM: I am a non-intervening critic. The paradigm which best describes my judging philosophy is tabular rasa. Arguments, consequently, have as much voting pertinence as evidenced by the debater advancing those arguments. Democracy and privacy have no value until evidenced as such. Evidence does not necessarily mean by citation and value can be established intrinsically. The focus in non-policy debate should be on the relative truth of the resolutional statement. Policy implications are only relevant when a policy-making paradigm is defended. A straight hypothesis-testing paradigm allows countercasing. In the absence of theoretical arguments, I evaluate arguments according to what I assume to be traditional-historical criteria -- rights are good; representative democracy is desirable; equity is just, etc. Theoretical arguments are often necessary and they are never disregarded unless they are punishment claims.

2. AFFIRMATIVE: Prima facie arguments for me entail the following stock issues: letter/exception (relevance/topicality), conflict of laws (relationship between some ill and the actors specified in the resolution), ambiguity (burden of proof/presuption) and inference (relational or consequential implications once the resolution is presumed true). I am strict on topicality and expect the affirmative and the negative to defend standards and the affirmative to answer violations. I am, however, amenable to arguments that suggest that topicality may not be a voting issue when the negative is definitially abusive. Topicality is resolved by evaluating violations against the standards best defended in the round.

3. NEGATIVE: Counter-warrants are ONLY valid when the affirmative is guilty of hasty generalization, when the focus of debate is on the resolution, AND when induction is the prefered logical system in the round. Presumption is debatable. No arguments are counter-intuitive. Debate is a testing ground for new ideas. Conditional arguments by the negative justify conditional arguments by the affirmative. ALL arguments are inherently conditional especially when we are discussing non-policy resolutions.

4. EVIDENCE: Proven fabrication is a voting issue and the violating team receives no speaker points. A failed charge of fabrication is a reverse voting issue. Evidence out of context is dropped from the decision calculus. Complete citation is unnecessary. I will read evidence after the round if and only if I erred in recording or if I am personally interested in the citation. Conflicting evidence is sufficient to cancel out an argument. Turnarounds generally occur on the link level. Impact turnarounds may be valid if and only if the turn is analytically superior. Debate theory evidence is foolish. Do not cite debate coaches and especially me.

5. STYLE AND DELIVERY: Cross-examination is binding. I feel the debate is yours. I will, however, not record what I do not hear clearly.

6. OTHER: No shifts. No new arguments in any rebuttal. No rudeness (I have dropped teams for being rude). No lengthy roadmaps. I strictly enforce preparation time limits.

Jeff Bile, Southern Illinois University, 8 years judging, 25 rounds on topic

I subscribe to a modified "Game Theory" PARADIGM. The only rules which bind the students playing this game are "Tournament Rules" which are specified by the tournament director(s). These "Tournament Rules" (typically format, topic, side, time limits, etc.) are NOT debatable, on everything else I will attempt to be Tabula Rasa. I will try to avoid interjection if possible. Like any human, my exposure, perception, and retention of communication is probably somewhat selective. I will do my best to minimize this, but my "likes and dislikes" may be subconsciously important. Minus argument, I will "default" to my likes.

I like debaters to construct arguments rather than make fallacious appeals to ignorance based on their nitpicking of the opposition's argument. I like comparison, contrast, synthesis, and "ballot writing" in the last two rebuttals. I like theory arguments, especially round developed rules which are inferred from tournament rules: i.e., "We have a topic, you are affirmative, hence you must affirm the topic" (Topicality is a voting issue). I like creative, controversial, unpopular, and "counter-intuitive" arguments and in an activity designed to promote critical thinking, I believe we should encourage them. I like argumentatively intense yet interpersonally pleasant debates. I dislike "cheap shots", i.e., ad hominem attacks. I dislike lies (misrepresentation of your or your opponent's argument, evidence, or "drops") which, as they diminish your credibility significantly, have the effect of (at least) reducing your points.. I dislike appeals to tradition, provincialism, and the suggestion that a lower standard of intellectual rigor is required simply because "This is CEDA!"

I do not see debate as an attempt to mimic the "real world" in any way, but rather think of it as an artificial laboratory for developing certain skills. Among these skills I see debate as uniquely well suited to the development of critical thinking skills and relatively unimportant as a mechanism for the development of mechanical, "public speaking", DELIVERY skills given the existence of alternate forums for this purpose. I believe this activity produces the greatest educational achievement when it maximizes the debating done by the debater and minimizes the debating done by the judge. I believe that there is an affirmative BURDEN OF PROOF which effectively creates a negative presumption. There is no minimum threshold of absolute SIGNIFICANCE on any argument but rather a relative one. Significance is a function of outcome multiplied by probability. There is an enormous difference between no link (0%) and a weak link (>0%). I believe that Constructive Speeches are for constructing arguments and that Rebuttal Speeches are for refuting and rebuilding previously constructed arguments but I will not argue for you that an argument is new in rebuttal (unless new in 2 AR).

Regarding TOPICALITY, it only makes sense to me that an argument cannot affirm/negate the topic if it is not topically relevant. Only/all arguments affirming the topic are affirmative arguments and only/all arguments negating the resolution are negative arguments regardless of who initiates them, providing you make the appropriate application. I tend to interpret topicality literally rather than socially, therefore "Everyone is running this" is no more a reason why an argument is topical than "This is a squirrel" is a reason why an argument is not topical. I default to the affirmative's right to reasonably define, minus an argument to the contrary. I tend to believe that the affirmative must defend the WHOLE RESOLUTION and hence negative counterwarrants (within affirmative definition) are as legitimate as affirmative warrants. I would prefer to see arguments be generic to the resolution (as defined) as they offer a sounder inference.

I will presume that any EVIDENCE read is "admissible" in that it is 1) in the public domain, and 2) verifiable (full cite available). If any evidence read is not admissible the user will be punished (minimum: toss out and point lowering). The debaters should read as much of the cite as they wish to be considered in weighing it. It is not necessary that complete cites be read, though they should be available. I will sometimes read evidence after the round when the exact wording is important and I have forgotten it.

Regarding THIS TOPIC specifically, I am bothered that 99% of the affirmatives make the straw man fallacy of selecting an argument for their opponent, then knock down that specific argument. Proving that a possible specific attempt to warrant X is untrue, does not prove that X is generally unwarranted. "Drug Testing reduces workplace drug abuse" is NOT the only way that one might logically negate this resolution. For example, debaters often focus on the policy of drug testing and fail to discuss the value of privacy. It is possible that invasions of privacy are generally warranted. I believe the subject in the resolution is regulations (not drug testing) although 99% of you ignore this as well. I have found the assertion that the resolution allows us to assume some part of it true (i.e. testing invades privacy) ignorant and irresponsible. Why stop there?

Judging Philosophy for Rodger Biles
Southeastern Oklahoma State Univ.

I believe that I would be considered a fairly traditional judge in that issues such as topicality, prima facie burdens and presumption carry a great deal of weight with me. Theoretical arguments are valid and I will readily accept them provided there is logic behind the theory, and that there is a legitimate reason to make the argument. Theoretical arguments that are made for the sole purpose of time allocation will be punished.

Counter warrants and counter definitions are a perfectly acceptable means of argument, and in fact, I feel if a negative team chooses to challenge an affirmative definition it is thier duty to present a counter definition.

As far as types of arguments that I will accept (i.e growth is bad, etc.) I will buy anything that is backed by evidence with clear and present links. I also, however, resent hearing blocks of link evidence that is ten years old. Affirmative teams faced with such issues should realize that I readily buy a "real-world" standard on that type of argument.

Speed is not a problem, provided the debator can speak clearly at whatever pace he chooses. While I accept a "spread" as a legitimate tactic, teams choosing it need to realize that I feel an argument worth making is worth extending. Therefore, spreads made merely for the purpose of tying the other team's hands time wise, then not extended will be suitably punished.

I find little useful comes from the Cross-examination period and would like to be proved wrong. Most teams base very little argumentation on answers from c-x, and that is an unfortunate mistake.

One other comment on style, I do not tolerate "tag-team" debating, where one partner tells another what to say during c-x and speeches. If participant gets two speeches and two c-x opportunities, and they are his to do with what he can.

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY

NAME: Kari Bitzer

SCHOOL: Central State University

Years Judging: 1 Rounds judged on this topic: 40

Paradigm

The overall role of the judge, as I see it, is to weigh and evaluate the argumentation in a round. There must be sufficient evidence presented to uphold any assertions made. If there is a question in my mind as to the context or validity of evidence I will ask to see it after the round. When conflicting evidence is offered, I take sources and application into consideration. Theoretical arguments are fine as long as they are adequately developed and supported.

Topicality

As far as topicality is concerned, if the affirmative is reasonably topical I would rather hear the negative address the case directly. I am liberal on topicality, however, when there is a substantial question as to the affirmative's position and it is properly established and supported by the negative, I consider topicality to be a voting issue.

Negative

Counter warrants, counter-intuitive and conditional arguments are fine as long as adequate connections are made and there is appropriate analysis to support them.

Style and Delivery

Style and delivery are important aspects of debate. Speed is fine as long as there is good organization and sufficient clarity. Cross examination should be used to clarify questions and establish points. Cross examination should focus on the issues.

Other

Basically, the debaters should establish their arguments with the support of evidence. They should weigh issues, establish significance and solvency adequately. As a judge, I look for clarity, analysis and evaluate the strength of the arguments presented.

NAME: Kevin Boyer
SCHOOL: University of Oregon
Number of Rounds Judged on This Topic: 35

Paradigm:

As a critic, I believe that rounds should be decided by debaters, with judges confirming the decision with the ballot. I do not claim to be completely tabla rasa, but remain so for any issue that can be justified. .This includes an acceptance of theory arguments, unorthodox arguments, turn-arounds, and strategic "disco." I do not believe that any argument that can be justified is "counter-intuitive."

Decision from me can be secured with a weighing of issues during rebuttals that accounts for all positions and explains how the ballot should be signed anyway.

Likes:

Innovative theoretical arguments that are applicable to the issues at hand: not generic. Clash in 1NC. Rebuttallists that make my job more simple. Quick enough speaking style so that I do not get bored. 1AR's that cover intelligently.

Dislikes:

New arguments in 2NR or 2AR. Generic, standard-less "value-objections." Mindless spread. "mindful" spread that makes critical decisions more difficult. Debaters that ask me to "look at the evidence." Nastiness without tact.

Speaker Points:

I believe that excessive speed is not necessary to secure a ballot from a critic that can "flow" it. Often speed is a liability, rather than an asset. If I feel that this has occurred, it will not affect my decisions, but will be reflected in speaker points. I award good 1AR's and good 1NC/1NR's because of the difficulty of those positions and the "small thanks" they usually get in speaker points. I subtract many points for new responses in 2AR, some points for new responses in 2NR and fewer points for new responses in 1AR or 1NR (assuming, of course, they are not justified by new positions). I do not allow new 2Ar arguments to become part of my decision and I will determine what is new (although I am lenient.)

Topicality:

Topicality should be a voting issue, but like any argument, if it is not argued correctly, the "topicality" section of the position can be won, but the impact can be forgotten or lost. All things (well, almost all) are debateable.

The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-4021

College of Communication

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT
1987 CEDA NATIONAL TOURNAMENT

NAME: James R Brey. Years Judging: 6
SCHOOL: Florida State University Rounds judged on this topic: 27

Paradigm. I am, in the strictest sense, Tabla Rasa. To me, that implies if you toss out an argument (any argument) I will flow it. If you want that argument to become an issue, develop it and extend it ("it" refers to the argument not the tag belonging to the argument) into rebuttals. If you want me to vote for the issue tell me so, then tell me why and how your analysis outweighs the opposition and justifies a ballot in your behalf. Left to my own volitions (you don't want to do that) I will weight arguments based on potential impacts. My vote is usually based on arguments and analysis extended in the last two rebuttals. I seem to have a clear bias for substantive issues as opposed to procedural issues.

Topicality. I have problems with the way CEDA debaters develop and argue topicality. At best, topicality (given the absence of a plan) is extra-topicality. Meaning those arguments associated with a faulty definition are to be ignored. I do not view topicality as an absolute voter. If you choose to argue topicality then develop it and spend time explaining: 1) standards; 2) alternate definitions; 3) violations; and 4) impact in terms of the round. Any thing less is really trying my patients.

CounterWarrants. CW are OK by me if their OK By you. If their legitimacy is questioned by the affirmative team, be prepared to defend them theoretically. Please don't waste your time and my time applying NDT CW theory here. Given the nature of the resolution, specific analysis needs to be presented. Any specific CW seem legitimate. Counter-intuitives are fine.

Evidence. You needn't read entire cites, but I expect them to be typed along side every card read in a round. I will read evidence after a round if that will help me make a better decision. Evidence on theory is also fine. I treat evidence distortions, falsifications, and unwarranted accusations very seriously. I will spend a lot of time determining the absolute truth to questions of evidence legitimacy.

Style. I tend to flow C-X. I view it as important and binding unless argued otherwise. Speed is no problem as long as you remember two things: 1) you must be able to condense and crystallize all that stuff into voting issues during rebuttals; and 2) comprehensibility is essential. Tag-team debate is warranted only if the information provided assists my ability to render an informed decision.

Other. Watch me. I've been told I give off nonverbals indicating my immediate perception of an argument. Good luck, and have fun.

1. Decision-Making C
vanced within the
Policy-Making; A
Qualitative Risk
2. Topicality: As t
issue. However,
generic thirty-se
3. Counterplan: I w
and it has an add
the counterplan n
4. Qualitative Advan
tative advantages
advantage, then I
5. Delivery of Argum
that I can flow a
that issue moot i
but don't count o
6. In General: 1)
2) No divine respo
your card, it is
the round. A tea
lose the round.

NDT 1984

CHUCK BRODY
UNIV. OF DENVER
DIRECTOR OF FORENSICS

YEARS COACHING: 2

teria: I am willing to listen to any criteria which is ad-
ound. In the absence of such a criteria, I revert back to
isadvantage is not required for me to vote negative.
harm is also enough to vote affirmative.
"spirit" of the resolution, topicality is an absolute voting
e negative must be able to win a specific topicality attack,
nd topicality is not suitable for everyday use.
l vote for a counterplan if it is non-topical, competitive,
ive advantage to its adoption. I would recommend that
be a "one-counterplan-fits-all-cases" counterplan.
ses: This, like every other topic, has a place for quali-
If the affirmative is able to justify the qualitative
ill vote for it.
ts: I debated with Dave Geislinger; I now feel confident
thing. If issues become muddled, I tend just to make
the round. I may ask for some key cards after the round,
me to make arguments for you.
baters are urged to isolate voting issues in the round;
ses in 2AR; 3) Full source sites are essential; if it's
ur responsibility to have the full and complete site in
which cannot provide the necessary qualifications will

Judging Philosophy Statement
1987 CEDA National Tournament

NAME: Don Brownlee

SCHOOL: California State University, Northridge

Years Judging: 14 Rounds judged on this topic: 20

1. Paradigm. The debate round should serve as a laboratory for the development of argumentation skills. These skills ought to be applicable outside the environment of academic debate. It is highly unlikely that evidence offered from a colleague in forensics will have such suasory power as to change my viewpoint during a debate.

2. Affirmative. I believe that the resolution is designed to give all participants (including myself) a notion of the subject to be debated. The affirmative is obliged to demonstrate an interpretation of the resolution that is consistent with the public dispute on the issue.

3. Negative. To succeed, the negative need not necessarily defeat the affirmative case. If the negative is able to demonstrate that the resolution is probably not true, given other grounds for judgment, then they deserve victory.

Presumption exists both as an attitude and as a structural element in the debate. All negative teams ought to benefit from the designated presumption against any resolution for debate. The attitudes held by the public toward the resolution may weaken or strengthen that presumption. It is this same presumption that makes an argument counter-intuitive.

Conditional arguments ought not to be supported by contradictory evidence. Beyond that requirement they are acceptable.

4. Evidence. Evidence is more than a 4x6 card. I am willing to accept, without documentation, claims that fit into the category of common knowledge. When evidence is testimonial, the utility of the evidence is a function of the credibility of the source. If the source and date of the testimony is well known, source citation is unnecessary. On the other hand, evidence introduced with "Smith in '86" establishes little reason to adhere to the claim advanced. More information is required to convince me that the testimony deserves credence.

I will examine evidence after a round under two circumstances: (1) if it is the object of an accuracy challenge, or (2) if I'm personally interested in the testimony, outside the context of deciding the debate. Excluding these situations, debaters ought not to expect me to follow their demand, "Look at it after the round."

5. Style and Delivery. Unlike the true addict, I do not attend debates for the thrill involved. It is important for debaters to realize that I will not strain to listen to speech much beyond a conversational rate or to tolerate behavior that is unacceptable in civilized communities. If a team's activity serves to inhibit argumentation, if they bitch, stall, lie, cheat, etc., then they deserve none of the rewards of the activity. A debater who will abuse a fellow student, or even a judge, in the pursuit of plastic trophies will probably also sacrifice honesty.

Debaters should pay greater attention to the environment of the debate judge. Judging can be tedious and boring, especially by the 40th or 50th round on a topic (occasionally sooner). Novelty and humor, along with other devices to maintain attention, are always welcome.

6. Other Comments. Rebuttals! The final two rebuttals, 2NR and 2AR, ought to make things perfectly clear. This is not a speech to recount every single issue that has been discussed during the previous hour, but rather to demonstrate why particular issues should lead me, the judge, to decide for your version of the resolution's truth. How rebuttalists assign time to the issues is an indication to me of the importance these issues should have in my decision. An issue assigned a two-second "pull II.B" is unlikely to be crucial in my voting.

Feel free to ask me questions during your presentation. "Did you understand that argument?" may help you know whether more explanation is necessary. If I feel it is fair to give you an answer at that point in the debate, I will.

DEBATE JUDGING PHILOSOPHY
1987 CEDA NATIONAL TOURNAMENT
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Dr. Raymond W. Buchanan

As an evaluator in academic debate, I consider myself both judge and critic. Obviously, as a judge, I must determine which team did the better debating in the round. My concept of "better debating" emerges from my background and interest in social influence. Concerning any round, I most often ask "which team presented the most compelling means of persuasion?"

However, I also consider myself a critic in the debate round. I have a perception in my mind, based on many years of experience and research, which reflects a standard of excellence in debate and, knowingly or unknowingly, I measure teams by that standard. Incidentally, I make my debate decisions before I rate speakers on speaking skills.

The paradigm which I am likely to use in judging most debates is what I describe as quasi hypothesis testing. I tend to adhere to the Aristotelian standard which suggests that in any proposition, we should strive to arrive at the highest degree of probability possible. My standard for judgement, then, is that which appears true most of the time. While I do not demand absolute certainty, I do expect teams to explore and test ideas thoroughly. I expect arguments to be critically analyzed and tested from the standpoint of their philosophical principles, as well as their utilitarian values. I expect teams to examine the strengths of the logic employed and the reasoning employed in any argument, as well as the quality of the evidence. I am especially concerned about causal links in reasoning, because over the years I have observed that debaters, in their haste to establish harms or problems, overlook this vital link. I listen to evidence carefully to make sure it applies in the way the debater says it does.

I would characterize myself as an "issue oriented" judge, as opposed to being "prescription oriented." While I consider such debate skills as analysis, refutation and delivery important variables in the total process, the issues in the debate will get my primary consideration. I am more interested in the quality of the issues raised, not in the quantity. Therefore, a "spread" does not impress me at all--in fact, it may have a negative effect on me. By this time of the year important issues have been clearly defined and refined, and there is no excuse for teams not clashing on central issues.

I strongly dislike topicality arguments. However, I recognize that sometimes they are necessary. While I consider myself broad-minded, I do prefer that an affirmative team's case be central to the topic rather than portray some esoteric interpretation which is counterproductive to good clash. Teams should understand that when they do choose to make a topicality argument, they take upon themselves the full burden of argument development. Topicality is an argument just like any other argument. I would assume that the definition or explanation which is most reasonable is a suitable standard for settling this issue.

I consider the use of good evidence to be primary in the pursuit of excellence in debate. I am deeply concerned with evidence credibility, as well as with evidence application. I do like for teams to qualify important pieces of evidence. I rarely read evidence after a round, but may do so if an evidence challenge is issued or I suspect a misapplication of evidence.

One final word on delivery. I consider debate to be an exercise in effective communication. Therefore, anything which interferes with the communication transaction is undesirable as far as I am concerned. As already indicated, I don't like the "spread" and I strongly dislike a wheezing, gasping debate style which presents material so rapidly that arguments become a blur. Excessive speed is, in my view, a deterrent to effective communication. I clearly prefer outstanding clash on fewer arguments than the blinding speed of a "spread artist." When I lay down my pen, look out! You are exceeding the speed limit!

Judging Philosophy Statement
1987 CEDA National Tournament

NAME: David G. Burns

SCHOOL: IUPUI (Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis)

Years Judging: 16 Rounds judged on this topic: 56

1. Paradigm: I do not believe a CEDA judge should be a virtual blank slate, prepared to accept anything posited by either affirmatives or negatives, but he should represent an audience member who can decide to accept or reject based on the most rational analysis. I do not tend to accept theoretical arguments; it's a real world and a real-world problem we are attempting to resolve. "End-of-the-world" scenarios insult my intelligence. I expect to hear a logical analysis of why one side better satisfies a current difficulty.

2. Affirmative: I expect to hear criteria based on current American values and standard definitions. Esoteric or strategic definitions by affirmatives that restrict for purposes of trickery annoy me, but I expect the negatives to do their duty and respond appropriately with sensible definitions. I am conservative on topicality; let's debate the proposition as stated and as understood by a reasonably intelligent audience member.

3. Negative: In my opinion presumption lies with that side upholding extant American values. I do not automatically oppose counter warrants, but view them with suspicion, and I react more strongly against a counter-intuitive argument. I have no immediate reaction against conditional arguments beyond wondering how they might fit.

4. Evidence: I expect to hear evidence to sustain assertions that are not obvious or within judicial notice, but I do not require all evidence to be fully cited. If I have a question about the accuracy of a piece of evidence, I may ask to see it--even though it is not questioned by the opposing team. If it is used incorrectly, I will penalyse; however, if the opposing team nails it, the penalty is correspondingly greater (One side gets points added, the other has points deleted). In weighing conflicting evidence, I use the standard tests of evidence. I am not annoyed to hear someone cite evidence on debate theory, but then again, I am not overly impressed that someone has read a book. Don't lecture me, though.

5. Style and Delivery: Cross-examination is designed to get information, to clarify issues and judging criteria, and to advance your arguments. I expect to hear use made of the CX's during constructive speeches. Delivery should be conversational but not careless; talk to me in a calm, reasoning manner. Force me to understand. Don't tell me to "Pull that across"; avoid jargon in any form. Screamers and fast talkers lose rather regularly when I am the judge. If I put down my pen, you aren't scoring.

1987 CEDA Nats. Judging Philosophy

Jimi Cantrill, Carroll College 9 yrs judging; 27 rds. on this topic

My role as a judge is to render a decision in light of the arguments presented in the round. While I consider the pure case of tabula rasa to be bogus (after all, we can only assess communication via the perceptual standards already established through previous communication), I try my best not to intervene in the debate. Hence, I will not pull arguments for debaters, cross apply issues unless instructed to do so, or "fill-in" the missing impacts. However, at the end of the round I flush the arguments remaining on the flow through the criteria that best serves the purpose of weighing the issues in the debate. Consequently, dropped arguments (especially those missed in 2NR) can become relevant. .

Affirmatives must present clear, reasonable, and appropriate criteria in the 1AC in order to be prima facie. If criteria is implicit then the debaters must be able to point to the specific area of the case where the standard is established; failure to do so constitutes jurisdictional ground for a negative ballot. On this specific topic, I am very conservative when it comes to topicality even though negatives must provide well developed arguments for the violation if such exists. Reasonability is key and all that is necessary for topicality (of course, this is another perceptual issue). On the other hand, if the affirmative is clearly topical, spurious presses by the negative designed to time-suck subsequent speeches can be dealt with post haste.

Counter warrants are fine as long as they meet the definitional ground established in 1AC (note that I detest most forms of observational definitions for their lack of clarity). A warrant, alone, does not grant presumption against the affirmative since, in most cases, the judge must weigh the impacts of the contending analyses. I have no problem with counter intuitive arguments as long as the evidentiaty links are sound (i.e., explicit); I do feel that many off-case creatures (e.g., beef and some forms of national security risk analyses) simply do not meet this burden of proof. Conditional arguments are my middle name and I believe they reflect many real-world decision making structures.

If you assert it, you must prove it with either evidence or judicial notice; full cites help to establish the ethos of a source but aren't crucial to the weighing of arguments. I only read evidence after the round if its content has been challenged and I didn't perceive the problem in the first place or (let's be honest, sportsfans) if I want to get the full cite myself. I weigh evidence via recency, probative value, and direct relevance to the claim advanced (this includes theoretical support as well).

CX serves the purpose of giving one's partner more preptime or, at best, establishing premises that must be developed in constructives. I can go slow or fast (i.e., 85% is about my limit for sustained periods) depending on what the kids in the sandbox want to do. Generally, it's best to adapt to what the other team is doing. The only thing I ask for is direct clash and some restraint in issuing junk spreads that have no argumentative value.

I hate sleaze (e.g., pulling new arguments out in rebuttals), stuff (e.g., saying an argument was dropped when it clearly wasn't), and rudeness. You can prompt your partner if you wish. I love humor, creativity, and determination. I'm a liberal victim of previous substance abuse with perfectly healthy urine.

1987 CEDA Judging Philosophy Statement: Short Form

NAME: Beth Carter

SCHOOL: Hired- LSU

Years Judging: 2 Rounds judged on this topic:

Debate Experience (circle all that apply):

(Debated in High School) Debated NDT (Debated CEDA)
(Coached High School) Coached NDT Coached CEDA

1. Paradigm. What paradigm (if any) best describes your approach to judging debate? (circle the best answer)
   A. Skills paradigm
   (B.) Tabula Rasa
   C. Hypothesis testing
   D. Critic of Argument
   E. Games-playing
   F. Other (please specify) _____

2. In a hypothetical debate round, if the affirmative team gives examples where drug testing is not justified, and the negative gives examples where drug testing is not justified, I would: (Circle the best answer)
   A. Vote Affirmative
   B. Vote Negative
   C. Vote for the team withe the most examples
   D. Vote for the team with the most significant examples
   (E.) Other/uncertain see Comments

On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree), how do you react to the following statements (for all of these questions, assume that there are no theoretical arguments on these positions):

3. The affirmative must only be reasonably topical. 4

4. Presumption is an important issue on this topic. 2

5. I find counterwarrants acceptable. 4

6. Counterintuitive arguments (e.g., growth is bad; totalitarian regimes are good) are acceptable arguments for me. 5

7. Communication skills are more important to me than the substance of the arguments. 3

Other Comments: 2

The importance of any of the above is how th. team uses information in support/refutation processes. Defense of your o. case and logical attack of your opposition are primary.

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

Cherie Carter

University of Southwestern Louisiana

Years Judging: 1 Rounds Judged on this topic: 20+

I. Paradigm:

I believe my role as a judge is to decide the significance and the merit of the information provided in the round. I like organization and signposting in a case and arguments.

II. Affirmative:

I do not impose prima facia requirements, if they are brought up by the negative team they are usually considered. Topicality is considered if it is way off base.

III. Negative:

Counter warrants and conditional arguments are substantial if they are significant and have merit in the round.

IV. Evidence:

Evidence weights according to its significance in the round. I seldomly read evidence in the round. Complete cites are not necessary, unless there is some question of its merit. Evidence is weighed according to its significance and its interpretation in the round.

V. Style and Delivery:

Cross-examination is for clarification in a round, not debate. Delivery is very important, especially when it is not understandable. I like a round that I can understand.

Russell Taylor Church

John Carroll University

Statement on Judging Intercollegiate Debate

Judging Paradigm: Debaters should decide the criteria and decision rules(s) within the debate. This decision making process can involve argument over the nature of the topic, definitions, criteria, reasonability and the purposes of argument and debate.

As a judge I make very few assumptions prior to the beginning of the debate. For example, I do not necessarily believe that CEDA topics are value topics. Nor do I believe that the affirmative or negative teams should defend a value or that policy implications are irrelevant. I do assume that the affirmative has the burden of proof and the negative has presumption unless otherwise argued. I also assume that there are certain specific minimum burdens that should be fulfilled in the first affirmative constructive speech. In particular, I expect the affirmative to present a clear decision rule along with arguments and evidence to show the decision rule has been applied to show the resolution is true. I also assume that topicality is a voting issue and there is very heavy presumption against arguments to the contrary.

Organization: I prefer a traditional division of labor by the negative. However, alternative negative divisions of labor can be effective if justifiable and coherent.

Rebuttals: New issues should not be raised in rebuttals. I ignore what I recognize as a new issue. But debaters should not assume that I always recognize all new issues. Second affirmative rebuttal has an obligation to defend 1AR responses. New answers in 2AR must be avoided. There is a heavy presumption against any new evidence in 2AR.

Attitudes: Debaters should be lovers and not rapists. I also believe very experienced varsity teams have special educational and ethical obligations towards less skilled novice teams. Arrogance and rudeness have no place in a debate round. I will intervene with my ballot and 0 speaker points to punish excesses. Debate should be enjoyable for all participants including the judge. Excessive concentration on either strategy or winning are almost always counterproductive.

Delivery: Speech in a debate can be considerably faster than normal conversation. Mindless, multi-point, empty label, spreading, however, is to be avoided and much of this kind of speaking is mindless. The CEDA Constitution calls for a balance among the various elements in debate including delivery. I therefore would be willing to consider voting on a delivery paradigm if argued in constructives against an offending team.

Judging Philosophy

Kathy Clark
Graduate Debate Assistant

Miami University
1st year coaching
7 tournements this year

Decicison Making Paradigm

I try to be a tabla rasa judge and let the dynamics of the debate decide the issues for me. If the debaters do not "write my ballot " for me, I will decide "on the balance" which team did a better job in the round. I am willing to listen to any paradigm that is accepted and argued by both teams. All arguments are debatable.

Topicality

It is a stock issue, and as such is debatable in any round that the negative chooses to introduce it. It may be introduced in either 1NC or 2NC. I do vote on topicality for the negative more often than the affirmative would like me to. However, when I do vote on T it is because it has been well developed and carried throughout the round. A thirty second one liner on T will rarely win the round.

Counterplans

They are fine, but they must be competitive and mutually exclusive.

Counterwarrants

I like them, and have voted for them.

Turns, Cross Ex,

I will vote on turns if they are clearly explained. Just screaming out "TURN!" and a tag line will not score any points with me.

Cross examination is binding. If your partner gives a stupid answer you are stuck with it. Try to use CX to clarify the issues raised.

Style

I like arguments to be concisely packaged and presented as voting issues. Speed is generally no problem, unless to attain that speed the debaters sacrifice clarity. If you present me with a solid wall of incomprehensible sound, it becomes your fault that I cannot flow this point.

Overall competence, clash of ideas, and courteousness are important to me. I look for solid strategic choices. 2NR has an easier time getting my vote if she/he collapses to two or three major issues rather than trying to cover a large number of smaller ones. Both 2NR and 2AR should be pulling together all the issues they have won. In effect, they should tell me why they deserve to win the round.

Joe Corcoran, California State University, Chico
Judging Philosophy Statement
1987 CEDA National Tournament

1. Judging Paradigm. I try to be as tabula rasa as possible. That means that I will listen to any reasonable argument. If no judging paradigm is offered by debaters, I will vote on the skill of the debaters, extension of arguments in rebuttals, preponderance of evidence, and analysis of risk. I will give presumption to the negative, unless argued otherwise. That means that all the negative need do is demonstrate that the affirmative has not met their burden of proof "beyond a reasonable doubt."

2. Prima facie and topicality. In order to be prima facie, the affirmative must address the two stock issues for value debate: the definitive and the designative. The definitive stock issue must include definitions and criteria. With this topic, the criteria must tell me how I am to tell the difference between a warranted and an unwarranted invasion of privacy. The designative stock issue simply applies that criterion. Topicality is a voting issue if the negative wins. I will consider standards of topicality as argued by either team. The best analysis will win standards. Affirmative is better off if they deny negative standards as well as show how they meet negative standards.

3. Counter warrants, presumption, and etc. The negative may run counter warrants in 1NC or 2NC only if they argue that the affirmative is subtopical. Otherwise, value objections or general negative arguments must indirectly apply to the affirmative case. Presumption rests with the negative unless the affirmative argues differently. If the affirmative does not argue presumption, all the negative needs to do is shed significant doubt on the affirmative position to win. Do not argue reductio ad absurdum arguments, such as growth, in front of me. I will listen to them, but it does not take much for the affirmative to destroy the links.

4. Evidence. I would rather hear quality evidence than quantity. Also, be sure to apply the evidence that you read. Do not simply read a pile of evidence. In rebuttals, I would rather hear constructive evidence re-explained, than to hear new evidence.

5. Style and delivery. I do not mind rapid speaking as long as you are communicative. I expect debaters to be fluent, clear, organized, and well-poised while speaking. Don't put down your head and speak as rapidly as humanly possible for five or eight minutes. I tolerate more speed in 1AR than in other speeches.

6. Likes and dislikes. I like bribes over $50.00, clear analysis, humor (especially in cross examination), and rainbow sherbet. I dislike bribes under $2.00, end-of-the-world arguments, uncommunicative speakers, and Budweiser beer.

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

NAME: WANDA COPPOLA
SCHOOL: TOWSON STATE UNIVERSITY
YEARS JUDGING: 2½ ROUNDS JUDGED ON THIS TOPIC: 25

1. PARADIGM- In every debate round, I feel a judge has a responsibility to be open minded and to enter the round with no a priori value judgements. I see myself as a reviewer of the substantive arguments presented and it is my job to determine the basic worth of an issue or value based on those arguments. This implies that presumption is not automatically granted to one side. The team with SQ should not assume they have presumption at the start of the round. In coordination with the "review board paradigm" or issues theory approach to judging, I apply the six criteria included on ballots (analysis, reasoning, evidence, refutation, organization, and delivery) to measure a team's ability. It is possible, however, for a team to lose a debate round because they failed to win the key issues even though they possess greater speaking skills. I like for a team to provide specific criteria (ex. what is criteria for unwarranted?) and will use the criteria presented if it is not contested in a proper manner. Decision rules may be set up in a round, as well. I react well to theoretical arguments provided the team running them understands the context and implications of the theory.

2. & 3. AFFIRMATIVE & NEGATIVE- Aff should present a prima facie case. I don't like brand new contentions brought up in 2AC. If the new contention in 2AC is essential for convincing me to vote aff, then it should be in 1AC. If it is treated more like an add-on, and PF burdens have been met, then I will accept it more readily. In CEDA debate, I generally believe the whole resolution should be debated (not atypical ex.s) and accept topicality as a voting issue. However, I will use reasonability as a standard. If the neg. is going to run topicality they need to believe in it and not run it just to have another issue on the flow. To run top. in terms of definitions, neg. needs to say why aff is unreasonable, present better defs., & tell me why I should accept these over aff's right to define. 2NC args. shouldn't all be generic; apply them to case. However, counter warrants are fine to run if neg. is running topicality and justifies using CWs. Aff. still has the option of attacking the theory and practice of CWs. The same applies for conditional args.-provide justification. Counter intuitive args or repugnant values are acceptable in that I see debate as an exploratory field for new ideas and expressions. Freedom to advance such notions exist in the debate arena & I don't dismiss them simply because they go agst. my better nature. However, with good analysis and evidence, it doesn't take too much to sway me to vote agst. these kinds of args. (ex. totalitarianism is good).

4. EVIDENCE- Ev. should be used in ea. round - analysis alone is weak. I don't expect every detail of a cite to be read, but like them as complete as possible. Skimming a cite down to nothing is not desirable, though (ex. "Richard, '83"). I will read ev. after a round if it will impact on my decision. If there is conflicting ev., debaters should suggest ways to weigh it (one card more recent than another? one source more reliable? moot? etc.). Debate thry. ev. is a legitimate way to back up any arg. provided debaters are familiar with the journal article from which the ev. came.

5. STYLE & DELIVERY- Cross X is an ideal way for debaters to obtain clarification, probe for weaknesses, and gain information. It should be conducted in a non-threatening manner & is not designed for ridicule. I penalize for rudeness with low spkr. pts. I like a professional delivery style, but appreciate a laid-back environment & humor. Expressive delivery is more persuasive than rapid fire. I accept a reasonable amt. of speed, and flow the round accordingly. However, excessive speed, especially if one-sided to "blow a team out of the water" is unfavorable. Organization ranks high with me. I like letters & #ers in outline form. Debaters should signpost. If I'm lost then you have lost points.

6. OTHER- DON'T label ea. arg. as a Voting Issue leaving me with 8 voting issues on the flow. Decide what is winning the rd. for you and stick by those issues.

GOODLUCK!

NAME: Mark Crossman
SCHOOL: Cal State Northridge
YEARS JUDGING: three

PARADIGM: I am tabula rosa to the extent that I will allow virtually any argument to be presented. I will, however, intervene against ridiculous arguments. Feel free to argue reality as a paradigm (at least in practice). I encourage arguments about debate theory. Do not support them with theory evidence (I find that phrase a contradiction in terms).

AFFIRMATIVE BURDENS: Prima facia requirements are pretty much up for grabs. Aff should meet primary burdens of showing a violation, etc. Neg may argue that aff failure to qualify sources (Jones in 83 is not a qualification) is a prima facie burden. I view topicality as a way to punish teams who bastardize the meaning of the resolution. It should not be abused. I accept the general premise of the punishment paradigm. Standards for topicality must be presented (pick one).

NEGATIVE: Warrants need to be justified. Philosophically, that presumes that aff is really close to a hasty gen. Presumption is an argumentative issue, it's up for grabs. Conditional arguments in CEDA are O.K. (Unless overly wishy-washy).

EVIDENCE: I believe that CEDA, or any form of debate, requires that debaters adhere to traditinoal rules of evidence. The whine that this "is CEDA" so I don't need evidence does little more than irratate me. I will read evidence after a round if it is critical. If evidence is critical however, the debaters should simply reread it if there is some doubt about the clarity of its original presentation.

DELIVERY: Delivery rate is up to you-articulation is important at any level or rate of speed. I really prefer not to be subjected to interpretation in debate rounds. Delivery is not a substitute for good argument. Cross examination should clarify issues and establish ground for future arguments. It is binding if the question asked and te answer given are clear and agreed upon by both parties.

OTHER: I dislike bad humor, overly rude individuals, and really silly arguments (testing leads to growth which will melt the polar ice caps). I've always liked the works of Hunter S. Thompson, Cajun food, and good beer.

KARL CROASMUN
Findlay College

I choose a debate team to vote for in the same way I choose a presidential candidate to vote for: I evaluate the substance rather than the style. My view of judging criteria in CEDA debate was best phrased by Kim Giffin and Wil Linkugel, Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1958. "In the tournament debate situation we are training future junior executives, sales managers, high school superintendents, etc., to be able to go before their boards of directors, school boards, or whatever their decision-making group may be, and effectively advocate a proposal. Such policy-forming groups are much more interested in solid reasons backed up by specific evidence than they are by a boyish smile, human interest stories, after-dinner jokes, or dramatic innuendoes."

1. Paradigm: I vote for the team that wins the arguments.

2. Affirmative: I have yet to hear a debate on this topic where the decision revolved around the definition of, say, "employee." Yet most affirmative teams feel obligated to read dictionary definitions of every word in the topic. Many people also seem to enjoy discussing "values" in the abstract, such as arguing that any violation of rights (however small) outweighs loss of life (however great).

3. Negative: arguments are "counter-intuitive" only if you make assumptions about what arguments are "intuitive" and whose standards of "intuitiveness" to use. I would consider it counter-intuitive, for example, to support a democratic political candidate.

4. Evidence: I don't like conclusionary evidence that speculates and has no reason or backing. I usually laugh when I hear "evidence" quoted from another debate coach telling me how to evaluate arguments in a debate I am judging.

Jacques P. DePlois

Pacific U. / Willamette U.

5 years judging, 17 rounds on this topic.

1) Paradigm Every round should be unique. Therefore I enter each round with the expectation that the teams will present and defend criteria. Any criteria is acceptable, as long as the team asserting it explains it and adequately develops it through reasoning.

2) The affirmative team needs to present some sort of criteria for evaluating the topic. They must present enough justification for the resolution in 1AC that a reasonable person would agree that the resolution is true. All definitions presented by the affirmative should be held to a "reasonableness" standard.

3) The negative team can present "countervarrants" or "countercontentions." Any method by the negative proving the resolution undesirable, independent of the affirmative contentions is OK. However, clash must occur with the affirmative on the issuespresented in 1AC. The negative team starts with the presumption that the resolution is not warranted. However, any new issues offerred by the negative must be defended by the negative. The presumption does not extend to counter-warrants. Significance is an important voting issue. Any example or indictments must be significant in relation to the parameters of the round.

4) The role of evidence is to help support arguments, not to become arguments in and of themselves. Therefore, the role evidence plays in my decision is how well did the Aff/Neg buid arguments out of their evidence? Rarely do I decide a round on the evidence itself, rather, a piece of evidence may become important because a team may not be correctly using it. For that reason, I will ask to see evidence after a round. Complete cites are not necessary during the round, but must be available.

5) Delivery is very important for me as a judge. Rapid delivery is not good communication, and does not build the argumentation skills academic debate attempts to advance. Cross-examination is important in demonstrating analytical skills.

6) I enjoy humor in a round. Within the context of the particular round, a speaker who uses humor shows their confidence in their understanding of the issues. Courtesy is also very important, for the same reasons as noted above. I do not like too much slang.

Craig Disbrow
Plymouth State College

Years Judging: NDT 2 years CEDA 4 years Rounds on topic: 16

CONGRATULATIONS, you have (I assume if you're reading this) been given the misfortune of having me as a judge. I am a real "bugger" (rascal) on a couple things, so let me tell you straight. I run absolute time constraints. Once the round begins, it does not stop unless someone in the round dies. I allow NO grace time, and will deduct whatever you use from prep or speech time. Do not test me on this. I demand courtesy to all in a round. If you don't believe this, ask a couple teams who have received 3 & 4 speaker points in a round. Do not "slime". I will find something to read rather than flow that type of nonsense. Do not over state the strength of your evidence. I know the difference. Do not lie about anything. You will lose.

I will flow and accept virtually anything you throw at me. I will take growth, beef, Emorys, or any squirrel that is substantiated, applied, and argued in the round. I am about as clear slated as they come. Just remember, weak arguments are easily taken out.

I will flow at whatever speed you want to speak at. Over 300wpm I start losing competence on the flow. If you can "spit" faster than that, please keep me in mind. I only flow in English. If you go too fast for your mouth, and I can't understand your words I will drop my pen. If you keep it up, I will read a magazine. I can remember not flowing a IAC,that sounded like Chinese, with a very good team that lost. If you speak clearly, don't sweat it.

I will only intervene as a judge on evidence and theory. Just give it to me straight, and I'll do what you tell me to. If you fool around with either category, you do so at your peril. I use a judicial model for judging. I view Sub Judice e.g. Topicality, Significance, Inherency, and Prima Facie Case as absolute voting issues. I prefer that they be argued in INC for fairness. Please don't bring them up in IINC, I won't flow them. I do not apply my own burdens in the round. Your opposition should supply and argue them. Give me a criteria, justify it, and go. If the opposition wants to take it out, I'd rather hear them argue it. It would be unfair to make you debate against my whims. I do try to be fair. Presumption can cut either way. If you think you should have it...argue it. I will flow and judge on: Criteria, Case, Underview, Philosophies, Counter Warrants, Observations, Plans (Oh My), Counter Plans, Counter Values, and Value Objections. If I left something out that you want to argue...argue it.

Please read near complete cites on evidence. I rarely, but will read evidence after some rounds. I will flow any evidence (theory too) that has anything to do with the round. The time constraints are yours as is the round. I prefer only to make the final decision. Other than that, it's up to you. DAMN THE TORPEDOS.

Judging Philosophy Statement
1987 CEDA National Tournament

NAME: Michael Domingue

SCHOOL: The University of Texas at Arlington

Years Judging: 11 Rounds judged on this topic: 29

I enjoy good debating.
A good debate is one where the affirmative case has a value, a criteria which stems from that value, and an application of that criteria to the resolution.
A good debate can pursue the resolution with or without policy considerations.
A good debate is organized.
A good debate has clash.
A good debate uses cross-examination as a means of gathering information and setting up arguments.
A good debate is one where opponents crystallize positions.
A good debate is one where rebuttalists balance positions and demonstrate why their position is superior to their opponents position.

I do not enjoy poor debating.
A poor debate is one where there is no clash, only arguments.
A poor debate expects me to choose the "correct" values, countervalues, warrants, counterwarrants, and decision rules without an explanation of why one is superior to the other.
A poor debate is inarticulate.
A poor debate depends on my reading evidence for any reason except that the quotation or citation is in question.
A poor debate demonstrates dire cross-ex and dire speaking.
ITEM: While you are speaking, if your partner calls out questions, answers, signposts, time signals, or directions of any kind, I deduct one speaker point from each team member per infraction.
A poor debate has little or no signposts.

I treat each round as unique. If you wish to argue fact, value or policy, I am amenable. I ask that when you refer to my colleagues in the form of evidence, you do so with respect. I will give an ear to these arguments, but since CEDA debate has few accepted theoretical tenets, you need to be very persuasive in your argumentation. Topicality, with standards, is an acceptable argument. You should know I am a very strict timekeeper. The time allotted the round is all the time we have to debate.Therefore, I do not listen after 8, 3 or 5. There is no "grace" period. Further, if you need to give me a roadmap, that comes out of speaking, I repeat speaking time, not prep time. Roadmaps, in themselves, possess persuasive characteristics. I give little eye contact and little nonverbal communication in general. But when I do look up or put my pen down or flip pages of my flow you best be watching me and adapt accordingly.

CRAIG A. DUDCZAK SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

14 years judging 35-40 rounds on this topic

1. PARADIGM--I take the role of the "critic-judge." As critic I believe I can and should comment about argument content and development as well as the debate practices exhibited in the round. As a judge I believe I should be non-interventionist. However, I have expectations. Quasi-policy propositions have a quasi-stock issues criteria. Affirmatives have a "Burden of Resolution" which I understand to mean they have to prove something besides claiming "Affirmative Presumption." I expect that arguments, either Aff. or Neg., adhere to a general standard of probity which means that they are understandable, plausible, and maintain fidelity within context. Theoretical arguments are fine if explained AND APPLIED.

2. AFFIRMATIVE--In addition to above, I expect Aff. to be prima-facie in constructives. I resist voting exclusively on Turn-arounds or new cross-applications, especially if they are at the expense of the original case claims (i.e., drop case to grant out vo's and then claim turn-around on remaining vo). In any event, new arguments in 2AR in whatever form (TA's, C-appl., etc) are void.

2A. TOPICALITY--It would take pages to define my topicality position. Either "best" or "reasonable" definition standards may be acceptable so long as the effect of topicality determination allocates both AFF & NEG approximately equal ground. I believe topicality should normally be run in 1NC and should not be run as a time filler.

3. NEGATIVE--The Negative has the Burden of Proof for claims it initiates. This is most frequently appropriate to value-objections. While I'm not always sure what is counter-intuitive, I am willing to entertain most any claim with the proviso that the burden of presenting the claim is upon the advocate. The more remote the effect or tenuous the link (or chain of links) to a particular effect, the less probative force the claim will hold. The advocate has the responsibility of explaining the argument with evidence that is plausible and in context. Conditional arguments should specify the conditions under which they become operational. If they aren't, they are likely to be discounted or treated as contradiction (if exposed).

4. EVIDENCE--Evidence should be fully cited and qualified initially. After its initial introduction, abbreviated reference may be used. I resist calling for evidence, and I certainly will not ask for evidence which has not been introduced into the debate. Furthermore, if you dispute the interpretation of a piece of evidence, reread it into the round as part of your challenge. Generally, I will ask for evidence only when there has been substantive challenge to its interpretation in the course of the debate. If it is not presented in a clear and understandable manner during the debate, I will not ask for it. I believe I am more qualitatively influenced by evidence than quantitatively, and the authoritativeness of sources cited helps me to resolve evidence disputes. While you certainly may quote debate theorists in support or arguments, I expect you to explain the argument rather than let the evidence or the tag constitute the entire claim.

5. STYLE AND DELIVERY--I don't pretend to be the "general public." Clear delivery and appropriate style aid my understanding of your positions. Appropriate humor is always helpful, and I disdain rudeness, especially in cross-x. Some people have the impression that because I can flow a spread, it is a practice I prefer. They are mistaken. If I can't follow you or find where you are on the flow, I will signal you with a quizzical expression, shrugged shoulders, etc. If you ignore my nonverbal requests for help, it is at your peril.

6. OTHER--I don't care for tag-team cross-x or speeches, trick cases or questions, evasive answers to straightforward questions, commercial evidence, or strategems.

Judging Philosophy Statement
1987 CEDA National Tournament

NAME: **SKIP ENO**

SCHOOL: **UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS - SAN ANTONIO**

Years Judging: 7 Rds. judged on this topic: 33

---

1. **Paradigm:** I like to describe myself as a tabula rasa critic, though I doubt that I am so pure. Give me criteria with which to weigh the arguments. I will decide on the basis of the arguments. If given nothing with which to evaluate, I will resort to a combination of stock issues (transformed in the case of a value proposition) and effectiveness of strategy.

2. **Affirmative:** TAC should present an analysis that encompasses all of the wording of the resolution. I weigh the effectiveness of contextual and operational definitions via clarity of analysis and clash on terms. I will vote on topicality, but my standards are stringent. "Shot in the dark" arguments on topicality annoy me; be thorough.

3. **Negative:** Counter warrants are fine when used to clash with affirmative examples that are hasty generalizations. Presumption is clear in a policy resolution, however, in a more value weighted context, I look for analysis supporting a claim for presumption. From there, presumption and how it was argued in the round only becomes a voting issue for me in a tie round--I consider it as a voting issue as a last resort.

4. **Evidence:** Evidence is critical. The depth of or superficiality of represents the research standards of the team. Beyond the raw data, the analysis of it, the persuasive use of credibility cites and the appropriateness of its linkage to the claim become vital to my decision making process. When there has been clash over a specific piece of evidence ("It doesn't say what they claim!" or "The tag doesn't match!"), I will call for the evidence after the round.

5. **Likes:** Intelligent humor--eccentricities that don't distract--politeness--debaters who enjoy what they are doing--enumerated voting issues--clear structuring--word economy--fluency--basketball.

6. **Dislikes:** Lack of clear structuring--shifting argument stances--conclusionary evidence without the benefit of credibility supports--rudeness--mumbling and spitting--pencil tapping--evidence without analysis--partially informed theory claims--ornamental gymnastics.

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT
1987 CEDA NATIONAL TOURNAMENT

PROFESSOR BILLIE WALKER ETHERIDGE
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO

Years Judging: 35 Rounds judged on this topic: 8

Debate must be judged by three criteria, simultaneously: by its appeal to logic, its appeal to pathos, and its demonstration of ethos.

Debate is fundamentally the exchange and challenge of ideas. An educational debate proposition always explores some issue involving social values. The assumption underlying any debatable proposition is that there is an equal amount of arguments and evidence on either side. It is the responsibility of those debating to discover, organize, and support the ideas for the side assigned, and to shape a "case" out of them. Each speech should be well planned, with each idea supported with the most credible evidence possible; each should advance the argument and engage the opposing arguements logically, clearly, and persuasively. The affirmative has the burden of defining the boundaries of the debate carefully, cogently, and fairly--the best definition should always be presented. The Affirmative carries the burden of proof; the Negative the burden of refutation.

Debating is public speaking and must always meet the criteria of effective persuasion. Persuasion requires that the logical arguments be shaped to appeal to the audience's understanding, interest, beliefs, and feelings. Persuasion is not a specialized jargon nor can genuine debate substitute excess quantity of evidence or rapid-fire delivery for quality of argument, advocacy, and persuasion.

Debate is and must remain ethical; this is its sine qua non. Debate is a clash of ideas, not of personalities, and it presumes appropriate, courteous behavior and speaking manner before, during, and after the formal debate period. This obligation extends to the behavior of every audience member regardless of partisan enthusiasm.

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY NDT 1984

NAME Richard H. Finton INSTITUTION Missouri Southern State College

POSITION Assistant Professor of Communications YEARS OF COACHING 22 years

NUMBER OF TOURNAMENTS JUDGED AT THIS YEAR 14

1. DECISION MAKING PARADIGM: The only problems that I have with paradigm would be the team arguing them would not extend the paradigm through rebuttals and many times there is a tremendous amount of wasted argument time in the constructive speeches. I would much rather see a debate team spend more time arguing affirmative case and extending stock issues rather than telling me how I'm supposed to judge the round.

2. TOPICALITY: In no way do I agree that an affirmative team has to cover all hazardous waste in this topic. I believe that the affirmative team can take specific areas such as acid rain, mine water drainage, etc., and be topical. The question in my interpretation calls for taking care of injuries in the present and future and we are touching on shaky ground if injuries are to be taken care of in the past. Topicality is a voting issue and I believe if a significant part of a case is not topical then the affirmative has not met their burden of showing that the topic should be adopted.

   On extra-topicality--if an advantage or harm-solution stem from an extra-topical plan plank, then the advantage is thrown out or the plan does not meet need in that area. This, however, is not a voting issue.

3. COUNTERPLANS: In most cases I have found that by rebuttals when teams run counterplans the debate has become a mass of confusion. The counterplan must be out and beyond the topic. The counterplan, in my belief, must accept the affirmative advantages. The negative can run at least one of their own advantages which relates to their plan as well as to affirmative advantages. It is imperative that the counterplan be carried by the negative team throughout the round with the exception of a conditional counterplan. I do believe that the conditional-counterplan may be dropped in rebuttals and the negative team can still win the round by strong DA's and caseside arguments.

4. ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS: I have no problems with add-ons and turnarounds. Add-ons must be relevant to affirmative strategy and policy. Turn arounds sometimes can become redundant because of debate lingo. I strongly prefer debaters to show how the argument has been turned rather than just stating "turnaround."

5. STYLE: It does not bother me for a debator to travel a speed limit of 55 miles per hour but I expect him to be understandable through his diction, articulation, and grammar. Debate is still communication. I expect the debator to read me through the round. That he should adjust to the occasion, and at least look up to see my smiling face. In cross examination it is for question and answer, not for long speeches, not for rudeness, nor evasive answers.

   In underview, give me what you have to argue with great extension, support with super evidence, stand firm with your arguments and I will base my decision on what happens in that particular round.

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT
1987 CEDA National Tournament

NAME: Cynthia Flowers
Years Judging: Off and on since '82.

Rds/topic: 50 by CNT

OVERVIEW: Debate is an educational experience in which healthy competition is a major component. I think each of you debaters should not only put forth your best effort, but that you should be learning analytical, reasoning, persuasive skills which will serve you the rest of your life. I weigh reasoning and good argumentation highly. I also weigh support which may be logic as well as statistics or testimony. I don't mean to imply that fallacious logic outweighs qualified testimony or quantified impacts. I want to hear YOUR reasoning.

I take each round as it comes. I expect the debaters to establish criteria. If YOU use debate theory, apply it to YOUR case, counter warrants, whatever. If you claim your definitional criteria are better, say WHY--apply the theory to the situation, the case, the counter warrants, etc. Theory arguments without reason are a waste of time.

STYLE AND DELIVERY: Jargon should not replace reasoning. Support your arguments and give reasons for your support. In rebuttals, remember that simple repetition is not refutation.

Cross examination counts--here you examine understanding, analysis, qualifications, significance. In Cross-X strengths and weaknesses become apparent. Delivery should be clear, articulate, persuasive. "Speed Kills" when you are no longer clear--a point unheard is unmade. Debate is an activity of communication. I appreciate efforts to communicate affably, courteously, and with appropriate humor. I don't like to see debaters insult one another. Nastiness takes away speaker points.

EVIDENCE: Cite sources in full on first mention (page numbers and publisher not necessary). You should be able to qualify sources. I read evidence when it is an issue--if I know the source well enough I don't bother. When evidence is in conflict the DEBATER should support the evidence claim.

OTHER: I think I'm moderate on the topicality issue. It is up to the affirmative to establish topicality. The negative needs good grounds for a challenge--generic challenges without reason don't cut it. On the other hand, "reductio ad absurdum" (anything leads to nuclear war, environmental devastation, and the like!) claims don't take much to beat with me as a judge. The claimant better have strong, supportable links or very weak adversaries.

43 ENJOY, HAVE FUN, AND APPRECIATE ONE ANOTHER.

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY
1987 CEDA National Tournament

Name: Doug Fraleigh
School: CSU, Sacramento
Years Judging: 10 Rounds judged on this topic: 40

1. PARADIGM. The role of a CEDA judge is to evaluate the arguments for and against the resolution. Either team may argue for a criteria to be used in weighing arguments, but if neither team can convincingly show their criteria is best, I will make a utilitarian, on-balance calculation of which side would be better for society. Theoretical arguments may be made, although they should be based on analysis. If you support a theory argument by quoting a debate "expert," rather than flowing the evidence I will take out my ballot and write "don't quote debate experts, I do not base my theory decisions on what some alleged authority thinks debate theory should be." I tend to give better speaker points for substantive arguments than I do for theory arguments.

2. AFFIRMATIVE. I am very liberal on prima facie burdens. On this topic, if the affirmative shows something is bad about drug testing, that's enough for me. Affirmatives have two constructives to be prima facie. I tend to be more liberal on topicality in NDT than in CEDA. Topicality is a voting issue (that is not debatable). I use the better definition standard. If the negative issues a list of topicality "standards," it is their burden to show how their definitions meet more of these standards than the affirmative does. If they do not, I will usually go affirmative on topicality.

3. NEGATIVE. My presumption in CEDA is in favor of looking at the entire topic. As a practical matter on this topic, I have not required the negative to limit their analysis to drug testing in the sectors of the economy isolated by the affirmative. But I also have generally not bought negative VO's based on liberal interpretations of the topic such as "controlled substances = plutonium." I do not mind counterintuitive arguments per se. But I do not buy into the argument that weak links plus big impacts means the VO wins because of risk analysis. Conditionality should be debated in the round, I don't feel strongly either way about it.

4. EVIDENCE. Evidence is very important to me in resolving issues of fact and is a legitimate way to win issues of value. Teams do not need to read full cites in the round, but I will place higher priority on evidence from qualified sources. Full cites must be available on the evidence. I do not normally read evidence after the round, so don't substitute "call for the card" for a rebuttal extension. Proven falsification is a voting issue. I weigh conflicting evidence by balancing the quality of the evidence presented. Teams should argue why their evidence is superior when evidence conflicts. If they do not, I will generally assume that each side's evidence has a 50% chance of being true and make my decision accordingly.

5. STYLE AND DELIVERY. I will flow anything I can comprehend. I would give a fair evaluation to any team wishing to argue that I should vote on delivery as well as issues in CEDA or punish a team for excessive speed. I do not like junk spreads which substitute jargon and questions for arguments. I do not feel compelled to vote for an unexplained response like "no threshold" just because the other team drops it. Cross-x answers are binding, but I do not like teams that misconstrue opponents cross-x responses. Go out of your way to be polite in cross-x. FINALLY, I like to see CEDA as an alternative to NDT, not a clone of where NDT was 15 years ago. Theoretical arguments based on this premise will be well received.

Judging Philosophy Statement
1987 CEDA National Tournament

Nancy Fraleigh
CSU, Sacramento
Years judging--6 Rounds judged on this topic--15

1. Paradigm. I have generally used the policy making paradigm in policy debate, but not found one particular paradigm to be helpful in value debate. At the end of the debate, the main issues I look at are: (1)Has the affirmative met their value criteria? (2)Do the values on case outweigh the value objections? The negative may dispute the affirmative criteria, and if negative criteria is fairer, the affirmative must meet the negative criteria. I do not like a lot of theory argumentation, it is usually not very interesting to me.

2. Affirmative. To be prima facie, an affirmative must establish value criteria and provide contentions which show they meet their criteria. I am moderate on topicality. Topicality is a voting issue. I do not like negatives to use topicality as a tactic against middle of the road cases. I will accept reasonable affirmative definitions rather than requiring the best definition, but the affirmative should not stretch reasonable too far.

3. Negative. I am opposed to counterwarrants. I will allow the affirmative to limit their analysis to a particular case area, but this area must be a significant aspect of the resolution. The negative has presumption but presumption only comes into play when their is a tie. I do not like counterintuitive arguments, particularly in CEDA. I am against conditional argumentation.

4. Evidence. I listen more to the logic of an argument than to the nuances of the evidence read to support it. Full cites need not be read, but must be available. I will occasionally read evidence after the round, but don't count on it. When evidence is conflicting it is up to a team to show why their evidence is better or I will disregard both pieces. I do not like theory evidence, with the possible exception of my husband's.

5. Style. Cross examination should be used to clarify or highlight weaknesses rather than a re-reading of evidence. I tend to lose interest when evidence is re-read and may miss out on your good questions. I definitely prefer persuasive delivery to a spread. When push comes to shove, I will vote on the arguments, but good delivery will be rewarded with good speaker points and overall impression makes a big difference on who seems to be winning the issues in a close round.

6. Other. Limit the use of jargon and abbreviations. Signpost your arguments in reasonable detail. Don't just say "on the B subpoint." If I can't tell where you are on the flow, I will flow your argument in a special lost and found column on my flowsheet. Arguments which make their way there more often end up lost than voted on.

Name: David Frank, Director of Forensics
School: University of Oregon
Number of Rounds Judged on This Topic: 22

Paradigm: I believe debate is an activity designed to teach bright students how to present and evaluate good arguments and to set appropriate value agendas. Evidence is at the center of the activity and I place great weight on the quality of evidence presented by an advocate. As such, debaters should focus their efforts on evaluating evidence and on justifying their value agenda. This resolution sets up a clash of value agendas. The affirmative may argue that the drug tests violate privacy and that they don't work. The negative may argue that drug tests deter drug use and do work. Given the relative advantages of both approaches, the advocates should attempt to argue that their value agenda is relatively more important in the current context than their opponents. Again, all positions and arguments may have worthy and valuable dimensions. Advocates do not need a nuclear war to win a debate or a line of arguments. All arguments are strong relative to other arguments and to the strength of the evidence presented.

Likes: I believe debaters should enjoy this activity and should treat others as humanely as possible given the situation. I enjoy a quick wit and and a clear delivery. I will flow arguments that I can understand. Debaters should present arguments with a clear delivery.

Dislikes: I absolutely dislike one line evidence; rude debaters and debaters who speak beyond their abilities to clearly enunciate their words.

Speaker Points: I award high speaker points to advocates who present the best evidence in the clearest fashion. I award high speaker points to debaters with quick wits and to those who will select well developed voting issues in the rebuttles.

Topicality: I am tired of negative arguments on this issue which do not need to be made. If an affirmative is running a stock case, then the negative should have a very good reason for arguing topicality.

Name: Paul Gaske

School: San Diego State University

Years Judging: 2 (1973 & 1984) Rounds judged: 3

Paradigm: I follow a logical positivist statistical model for adjudicating rounds. My alpha level is normally .05, however I can be persuaded to decide the round using a .053 level of significance. I will analyze the arguments, pull out a calculator and reach a conclusion on the affirmative's level of significance. If the number is .05 or below the affirmative will win.

Affirmative: The affirmative must show solvency. I will accept topicality at any time, but I am partial to arguing topicality in the 1NR (for strategic reasons). My topicality standard is parameters. I also think the policy affirmative should deal with the first amendment.

Negative: I will accept counter warrants only if they are specific to the affirmative problem area. Presumption is the most important issue in the round. Negative has presumption and need only prove that drug testing is kinda good to win. (See .05 lecture above).

Evidence: Should read page numbers, however other citations are optional.

Style and delivery: Cross-examination is a voter. I like big fast teams that run meatballs. I am partial to male/female teams, because I think they look cute together. Additionally, I like teams to wear burgundy suits, with brown beattle shoes (don't comb your hair).

Other: I like debate. I think its fun to watch the clash of argumenation. It reminds me of two titans battling each other to the death. Any other issues are irrelevant in my decisions. I particularly enjoy hearing prolif, growth, beef and other related disads. Hope this helps.

NAME: John Gates
SCHOOL: San Diego State University
Years Judging: 2 Rounds judged on this topic: 40

1. Paradigm. I think that the role of the CEDA debate critic is to determine whether the resolution is probably true. Thus, Zarefsky's notion of hypothesis testing is the paradigm that probably best describes my approach to judging debate. As such, I will consider solvency and other policy implications involved in adhering to a value. I will consider arguments and evidence on theoretical issues not dealt with in this statement.

2. Affirmative. I view topicality as an absolute prima facia issue. I tend to be rather conservative on this issue. That is, I will adhere to the best definition offered in the round. However, standards for determining which among competing definitions is best are arguable. Please be explicit on standards and violations when arguing topicality.

3. Negative. I consider the use of counter warrants to be an acceptable negative strategy, provided that the negative justifies their use against a particular affirmative. In order to ensure that the resolution receives a rigorous test, I place presumption against it. I may be persuaded by counter-intuitive arguments, given that the necessary links are provided.

4. Evidence. In citing evidence, debaters need only read the source's last name, QUALIFICATIONS, and year. I will call for evidence after a round if an issue is very important and I am unsure what the evidence said. If two pieces of evidence (from opposite teams) are conflicting, I will apply three standards: First, quality of the source; second, specificity of the evidence; third, recency of the evidence.

5. Style and Delivery. I consider answers given in cross examination to be binding. Of course, they must be developed into issues during a speech for me to consider them. I vote entirely based on what is on my flow. Thus, it is the debater's responsibility to get arguments on my flow in the appropriate place. Be responsive to feedback. I do not like a rapid delivery for its own sake, but I understand that it may be necessary in some speeches. Humor and lots of courtesy are appreciated.

ANN GILL COLORADO STATE UNIV

Years judging 30 rounds on this topic judged

1. Judging Paradigm.
I am not a tabula rosa judge; I bring to the round the knowledge and standards of a reasonable person. I vote based on criteria. I prefer a debate on issues related to the topic rather than debate theory.

2. Affirmative. Prima facie burdens of the affirmative include meeting the terms of the resolution and the standards set out by their own criteria. If topicality becomes an issue, my vote will follow the arguments about definitions. Affirmative definitions must be reasonable.

3. Negative.
Counter warrants are legitimate in my eyes, counterplans are not. I am open to persuasion on presumption. Counter-intuitive arguments are dealt with from my reasonable-person paradigm. However, the other team must supply the argumentation that allows me to reach a position of reasonability.

4. Evidence.
I seldom read evidence after the round unless it is key to the debate. I expect debaters to present rules for weighing conflicting evidence. I listen carefully to evidence and ignore arguments not actually supported by evidence claimed to support them. I do not require "standards" for such statements as "topicality is a voting issue."

5. Style and delivery.
Cross examination is binding. I prefer clash in debates, outstanding analysis, intelligibility, and courteousness. I accept speed only where necessary to respond to arguments. I create a presumption against teams who spread for the sake of spreading or who are originally responsible for muddling a debate.

6. Summary.
If I do not hear, understand, or know where to flow an argument, I ignore it. I expect debaters to adapt to me rather than being willing to be a captive to every passing fad of debate theory, terminology, or practice dreamed up by debaters.

CEDA Judging Philosophy

Mary Gill
University of North Dakota
Four Years Judging 12 Rounds judged on this topic

Paradigm: I tend to be a critic of argument in CEDA debate.At best a judge may have policy implications to weigh which I feel evolve into which side best supports their position. Support may be in the form of evidence and/or reasoning based on evidence. I find the greatest omission in CEDA is the lack of good reasoning used by debaters. I do not like to be read to from the CEDA Yearbook and for debaters to treat this as the "theory" of CEDA. At best it is one author's opinion. I think theoretical arguments are in order with this topic. However, they should be supported arguments from established sources. I do not accept that those who have written "policy" texts are not applicable evidence in CEDA.

Affirmative: The affirmative has the burden to demonstrate significance and resolutionality. They must be able to prove what the resolution means, that it is worth considering(that it affects more than an isolated group), and that the drug testing is the evil. I do not accept the affirmative positions that the generic regulation will cause the collapse of the world. I think this takes the absurd position. Topicality is a voter. The affirmative should be able to defend how they are topical--this requires more than saying "golly we are topical." Best definition wins over reasonable with me.

Negative: I detest negative teams who try to make affirmative teams prove everything. The negative has the burden of refutation. They can tell me what the affirmative has not done that they feel an affirmative must. This is not sufficient for a win however. The negative must also deny what the affirmative has given. I love counter warrants if debaters know how to use them correctly. I detest negative teams who merely steal the NDT briefs for VOs. I think specific links must be given to this topic. Conditional arguments do not belong with the negative position with this resolution.

Evidence: Evidence is needed to support positions. Recognizable sources should be read. If I could not identify the source and find it from the cite given in the round then it is not sufficient. I read evidence that is contested or claimed to "say all." I prefer that the debaters weigh conflicting evidence--tell me why one is better than the other. If they do not, I do evaluate the evidence and determine which is best and/or most believable. Evidence on theory is great. Claiming the articles from CEDA Yearbook are the only "theory" for CEDA is not a wise move.

Style and Delivery: I hate inarticulate debaters. I hate needlessly fast. Speed is not a criteria for me. A team which speaks slowly and covers all impresses me more than a team trying to speak as rapidly as possible and does not cover the needed points. I will take it as fast as it can be articulated. Manner of delivery is a low criteria for me. Cross x should serve a purpose. Debaters should know when to "give it up."

Other: I detest CEDA debaters who pimp NDT. The "punish them they sound like NDT debaters" makes me angry. I am tempted to punish those who dare run such a bogus argument. I do not like rudeness or pompous debaters. I think this is an academic intellectual exchange where winning is important but winning is not everything.

CANNOT Judge USC[illegible]; or LSU-BR

1987 CEDA Judging Philosophy Statement: Short Form

NAME: Ron Greene

SCHOOL: LSU - Baton Rouge

Years Judging: College 4/Hofstra Rounds judged on this topic: 25

Debate Experience (circle all that apply):

(Debated in High School) (Debated NDT) (Debated CEDA)
(Coached High School) (Coached NDT) (Coached CEDA)

1. Paradigm. What paradigm (if any) best describes your approach to judging debate? (circle the best answer) A. Skills paradigm
   (B) Tabula Rasa
   C. Hypothesis testing
   D. Critic of Argument
   E. Games-playing
   F. Other (please specify) _____

2. In a hypothetical debate round, if the affirmative team gives examples where drug testing is not justified, and the negative gives examples where drug testing is not justified, I would: (Circle the best answer)
   A. Vote Affirmative
   B. Vote Negative
   C. Vote for the team withe the most examples
   ‡ (D.) Vote for the team with the most significant examples
   (E.) Other/uncertain

On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree), how do you react to the following statements (for all of these questions, assume that there are no theoretical arguments on these positions):

3. The affirmative must only be reasonably topical. 5

4. Presumption is an important issue on this topic. 1

5. I find counterwarrants acceptable. 5

6. Counterintuitive arguments (e.g., growth is bad; totalitarian regimes are good) are acceptable arguments for me. 5

7. Communication skills are more important to me than the substance of the arguments. 3

Other Comments:

I SELDOM VOTE ON HASTY G.
I SELDOM VOTE FOR A NEGATIVE W/OUT A V.O

‡ I think this question was a typo; if both teams prove that DT IS NOT justified then I vote Aff. HOWEVER, assuming that the word "not" SHOULD →

be corrected from the sentence concerning the negative team then my answer would resemble D. York for the team with the most significant examples. The question of "time-frames" Apply to my determination of "significant".

JULIE GRAVES
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

JUDGING PARADIGM

When judging a round, I follow the Judicial paradigm. Criteria for the evaluation of the round is crucial. I consider both affirmative and negative positions equally, determine a standard, and then develop a hierarchy for the arguments that are presented. Naturally, this allows for the affirmative to establish a claim for presumption depending upon the justification argued and on the wording of the proposition.

If the affirmative presents a prima-facie case in 1AC, then the negative should not follow with a prima-facie position against the affirmative case. This can also apply to topicality arguments. Needless topicality arguments are a waste of time and should only be argued if applicable. However, I do consider topicality and prima-facie requirements as major voting issues.

Counterwarrants, counter-intuitive arguments, and conditional arguments are quite acceptable as I find them to considerably enhance the debate round. However, links must be strong and well established before I will completely accept them.

Evidence should be pressed for credibility and reliability by both teams. The general tests of evidence and statistics should be used in determining the best evidence in the round. Complete cites are not necessary, but the availability of these cites must be present for the opposing team as well as for the judge. Debate theory evidence is fine if it is applicable.

I have always placed great stress on style and delivery in debate. I do not appreciate or admire debaters who tend to forget that this is an activity in persuasive speaking. I have no problems with a fast delivery rate as long as the debaters are clear. Signposting is of utmost importance. If I don't get it down on the flow, it won't be voted on.

Debaters should also remember to give considerable eye contact when they are speaking. Don't fall into the trap of relying too heavily on your notes especially when you are explaining your arguments.

In CX, I do not enjoy hearing obnoxious debaters who won't let their opponent finish answering questions. I do like to hear debaters who can use the CX time to their advantage by bringing up crucial information they may have gained for upcoming speeches.

If you enjoy using humor in the round, feel free. I love it!

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT
1987 CEDA NATIONAL TOURNAMENT

NAME: Captain Andrew M. Grimalda
SCHOOL: United States Military Academy

YEARS JUDGING: 1 ROUNDS JUDGED ON THIS TOPIC: 30

I will base my decision on the criteria set by the Affirmative. I will accept almost any criteria unless the Negative can convince me that the Affirmative's criteria makes the case non-topical -- which is difficult to do. So long as the Affirmative interprets terms as would a reasonably rational person the case will be topical.

Given the nature of value debate, I do not think that either side can claim presumption. Because we are arguing about the way things "should" be, both teams shair in this burden of proof.

I can and will flow any argument presented at any speed except those that are clearly ludicrous, e.g. drug testing is the threshold to WW III and the planet's eco destruction.

I don't care how fast a person speaks so long as he/she is understandable. The lack of analysis when presenting bullet point arguments will be reflected in lower speaker points. I much prefer quality over quantity.

Strong evidence does play an important role in my decision making process. Remember, however, good evidence with no analysis is just about as effective as bad evidence.

During rebuttals, I am not interested in hearing a point by point rehash of ideas presented during constructives. I want to hear persuasion, analysis and a crystalization of the key issues.

1987 NDT

Sherry Hall U. Kentucky, 2 yrs coaching
11 tournaments, over 70 rounds

DECISION MAKING PARADIGM- I have no basic preference for one paradigm over another. Basically, I view the debate round as an educational activity, and my role as a qualified "grader." I will accept virtually anything the debaters want to do (with the exception of changing the order of the speeches or other structural changes.) I prefer deciding rounds on substantive issues like Disads or Case sig over having to resolve theoretical argumentation like reverse voting issues. I do not like to intervene into a round, and do so only when the last two rebuttalists fail to provide a framework for resolving close issues.

TOPICALITY- While I still dislike topicality debates, I have found myself voting on topicality more this year than other years. I don't have any preconceptions as to whether establish modifies restriction or freedom. Most topicality argumentation is usually picky semantic games. I also dislike lengthy debates on standards that are never applied to the violation. If a violation is clearly won, I will vote on it, but I have a strong affirmative bias on this issue.

COUNTERPLANS- Generally, I prefer net benefits and mutual exclusivity as competition standards, but if the theory is defended correctly, resolution competition is fine. I am pretty much open to re-planning and/or permutations. However, in most rounds neither of these are well developed. Permutations must be clearly developed. My basic feeling is that permutations are only a test of competition and do not have to be topical because there is not actual policy alteration occuring, but I will listen to arguments to the contrary. Counterwarrants, hasty generalizations, conditionality, are all O.K. as long as the theory is defended well and both teams are able to explain the implications.

STYLE- I detest rudeness in rounds. I do think C-X is binding, but any arguments brought out in C-X must be made in a speech to factor into the decision in the round. Falsified evidence results in a loss with zero speaker points, as does unsubstantiated claims. I don't like punishment and reverse voting issues. I will not read evidence that was delivered incomprehensibly, or pour over tag lines that don't make sense. I give a lot of weight to the last two speeches. On this topic I think the affirmative must specify an agent. It does not necessarily have to be in the plan, but if asked in CX after 1ac affirmative must give an answer and stick with it.

JAMES HALLMARK—OKLAHOMA CHRISTIAN COLLEGE—Judging 4 years-53 rds this topic

1. PARADIGM—Borrowing from a policy perspective (which isn't unusual for CEDA) I put myself in a policy making paradigm unless it is specifically argued in the round that I should do otherwise. The criteria is the ultimate standard by which the "value" should be assessed and I "weigh" issues (dead bodies, ads & disads, etc) to determine the desireability of a value. I think policy implications are legitimate arguments. But I am also amenable to arguments indicating that I should NOT accept policy imps. But don't say, "This isn't NEG" and expect me to throw out any argument.

2. AFFIRMATIVE—I tend to be pretty liberal on topicality. Unless it is argued as jurisdictional or something similar I am not likely to make it the ONLY issue in the round. If the aff is "grossly" nontopical, you can expect to be punished. BUT to contradict myself, I like to hear innovative approaches—just make sure they are topical. (If you do something strange, slow down a tad so I can digest it.) Incidently, the appropriate standards for topicality are debatable. This topic also places presumption in a debatable position. Significance is also debatable in that we don't know what is supposed to be significant. Solvency seems to be important on this topic and although the topic doesn't necessarily call for it, I seem to be influenced by my intuitive desire to see the affirmative solve the drug problems without drug testing.

3. NEGATIVE—I'm not too thrilled with "Emories" for they usually lead to lots of generic arguments. Emories give 2nd neg 22 minutes to work on case. With that much time, I think 2NC has the burden to have more than standard responses. My grandmother could come up with something in 22 minutes. In general, I am much more likely to vote for an argument explicitly linked to the aff case than a generic argument concerning the resolution. (Don't bother reading me theory on this point—it is my own pet peeve.) I buy counter-warrants when I have to. But much like emories I don't think they foster good debate. In terms of your high school D.A.'s, don't run them unless you have updated the evidence and have good links (and that includes the ever popular 1977 toto evidence.)

4. EVIDENCE—I don't need complete cites but it should be available. I do want to hear qualifications. I will only read ev after the round for 2 reasons: 1) challenges, and 2) my forgetfulness. Evidence on debate theory is puré speculation and is usually cut such that it is conclusionary. I am more interested in the reasons why the conclusion was reached.

5. STYLE AND MISC.—I have yet to hear anybody so fast I can't flow them. The key to "speed" is organization and enunciation. What I hate is senseless speed. This is cranking out 43 subpoints when 41 of them are "sluffs." If you are doing something wierd—slow down. I probably won't look at you much so don't take it personal. Even it you hate your opponent, be extremely nice to them. I don't like it when you tell your partner what to say or cover WHILE THEY ARE SPEAKING. They are on their own. Finally, what is dropped in rebuttals is gone for good. No cross-applications in 2AR.

1987 CEDA Judging Philosophy Statement: Short Form

NAME: Ralph A. Hamlett

SCHOOL: Louisiana State University

Years Judging: 6 yrs. Rounds judged on this topic: 5
Debate Experience (circle all that apply):

Debated in High School — Debated NDT — Debated CEDA
Coached High School — Coached NDT — Coached CEDA
Taught Argumentation and Debate--College

1. Paradigm. What paradigm (if any) best describes your approach to judging debate? (circle the best answer) A. Skills paradigm
B. Tabula Rasa
C. Hypothesis testing
D. Critic of Argument
E. Games-playing
F. Other (please specify) _____

2. In a hypothetical debate round, if the affirmative team gives examples where drug testing is not justified, and the negative gives examples where drug testing is not justified, I would: (Circle the best answer)
A. Vote Affirmative
B. Vote Negative
C. Vote for the team withe the most examples
D. Vote for the team with the most significant examples
E. Other/uncertain

On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree), how do you react to the following statements (for all of these questions, assume that there are no theoretical arguments on these positions):

3. The affirmative must only be reasonably topical. 1

4. Presumption is an important issue on this topic. 4

5. I find counterwarrants acceptable. 3

6. Counterintuitive arguments (e.g., growth is bad; totalitarian regimes are good) are acceptable arguments for me. 3

7. Communication skills are more important to me than the substance of the arguments. 1

Other Comments:

1987 CEDA Judging Philosophy

Dr. Edward J. Harris, Jr.
Suffolk University
Yrs. Judging: NDT 8 CEDA 5 Rounds Judged on this Topic: 30+

1. Paradigm: I follow a Gamesmanship approach. That essentially means I combine Tabula Rosa with a view that debate is a fair game. Every issue should be debated in terms of its fairness (if definition shifts leave Neg. no ground, that is unfair and I would vote against it). All issues have to be argued in the round. I vote on impacts and I will vote on Topicality, but I am bored by theory arguments, expecially supported by evidence from coaches rather than argumentation theorists.

2. Affirmative: I have a low tolerance for prima facia arguments unless they are argued as being unfair (see above). I believe, generally, that T is a voting issue but reasonableness is an adequate defense. I like add on's and I will vote on turn arounds even if Aff. drops case.

3. Negative: Counter warrants are fine, but they must remain in the bounds of fairness and games theory. I expect the debaters to argue presumption, I don't assign it to a team or attach a value to it until the debaters do. Counter-intuitive arguments are fine, as are conditional arguments, so long as fairness is followed.

4. Evidence: I am an evidence judge. I will read evidence after rounds if it is challenged or comes into serious question or if I doubt its context. I expect the debaters to tell me how to assign weight to evidence.

5. Style and Delivery: Cross X is binding. I care about coherence not speed, but I don't consider debate an oratory contest. Give me good structure and don't try to use speed for speed's sake.

6. General: Be courteous and reasonable. Don't expect me to believe 2AR mystery cross applications or magically expanding responses. I don't do disco and I hate cute.

Jack Hart
Vanderbilt University
Nine Years
65 rounds

Judging philosophies are very similar to cross-examination periods: they are both innovations whose potential have not yet been fully realized. Often a critic's written philosophy has very little relation to his or her comments on the debate ballot. Debaters bear their share of the blame as well. Many misinterpret statements made in judging philosophies even worse than they do some of their evidence. What follows is therefore not a sweeping statement of my philosophy of debate (see ADVANCED DEBATE: THIRD EDITION for that) but instead is designed to try to give you some specific advice on how to optimize your chances of picking up my ballot. In general, my philosophy is that I try to judge the round based on what debaters tell me in that round. What they fail to tell me is left to my preferences, some of which are as follows.

PARADIGM. CEDA theory is a generation behind that of NDT (which is perfectly normal considering it is more than that time0length younger). I have found no coherent world view for this activity that I find acceptable. I come from a strong policy making paradigm and apply those standards whenever possible. In the meantime, I hide behind Balthrop's term, "critic of argument." (NB. This comment should hopefully subsume any specific theory comments.)

STANDARD OF SIGNIFICANCE. I find most CEDA topics closer to questions of fact than of value. In weighing values, I agree with Lichtman and Rohrer's position that it is difficult to determine the worth of a value outside of its policy ramifications. This is not to mean that a quantified harm will always outweigh a qualified one.

EVIDENCE. The better the supporting documentation is, the more likely I am to buy your position. This means more than just having a more recent publication than your opponent. Source qualifications, the explanatory power of the evidence, the debater's understanding of the context of the evidence, and the level of bias in the evidence, are all elements to be considered.

ANALYSIS. All to often debates consist of two initial opposing positions which are then merely repeated in rebuttals with new evidence. In a true rebuttal, a debater extends his or her position by explaining why his or her position is still warranted in light of the opposition's argument. This is especially true for the final two rebuttals which are summary rebuttals, they tell me not only which arguments each side has won but they should tell me why winning those arguments wins that side the round. I tend to reward debaters who correctly perceive how individual arguments interact in the totality of its position through cross-applications, contradictions, etc.

CROSS EXAMINATION. Learn to use the answers you get here. Answers made in cross-ex are binding (this includes "I don't know," meaning any sandbagged explanation by your partner is a shift).

STYLE. If you wish to view my NDT background as equating me with theanti-Christ, that's OK. I'd rather have that than for you to be incoherent for eight minutes (as cathartic as that experience may be for some of you).

All in all, I hope you will feel that I attempt to objectivity and correctly evaluate whatever strategy you decide to take. Feel free to approach me about any questions you may have.

Quentin Hebert
Duke University
5 years judging
18 rounds on this topic

My role as a judge in CEDA debate is to act as a critic of argumentation. At the same time, I try to give as much leeway as possible to the debaters to develop the round as they wish.

Topicality should be reasonable and rational. But what I require in order to be reasonable is a fairly heavy burden, not a rational basis test.

I will accept counter warrants, if they are justified in the round. Counterintuitive arguments are fine, so long as they meet standards of good argumentation.

Complete cites are unnecessary, although qualifications add weight to the evidence. I prefer that cards not be conclusionary - i.e. the evidence should contain some analysis. I rarely read evidence after a round, unless it is specifically challenged. Theory, if it is justified, is fine. Avoid generic labeling of theory arguments, they should be applied specifically to present round. In other words, theoretical positions can differ in application to a specific context.

Speed is fine, IF it is comprehensible.

I have a strong dislike for undeveloped or incomplete arguments.

Pierre Heidrich WEBER STATE COLLEGE
NUMBER OF TOURNAMENTS 18

TOPICALITY this should probably be a voting issue however, many times it is not. To argue topicality you should provide me with a method to evaluate the definitions which inevitably come out in the round. (What is better? What is more debateable?) This topic is a mess, for example: is it Federal Courts or is it federal courts or are the capital letters irrelevant? Normally extratopicality just keeps the affirmative under control. It should keep them from using strange things to solve what the topic was meant to solve. I find it hard to vote against a team as long as there is some topical advantage left at the end of the debate.

COUNTERPLANS It is handy to be mutually exclusive. It makes th debate very clear. Sometimes it is tough however, and then I will need to have a forced choice. I dislike general counterplans unless there are some good competition arguments. Permutations have gotten kind of out of control and many teams throw the word around. How can an affirmative team make assumptions about the world created by the counterplan? or Can the negative permute the affirmatives court restrction to solve the advantage impact? I think my point is that we should not just use the word we should explain the assumptions and implications. Sometimes topical CPs become a reason to vote for the topic. As long as I hear about it before 2AR. Most counterplans on this topic seem to move in th same direction as the affirmative, this does not force much choice I HATE COUNTER WARRANTS ON ANY TOPIC!!!

CONDITIONALITY I do not like to punish but I will if forced to. Blips on this issue will be punished because of this arguments implication. I like a consistent debate. Should a CP go away because it is conditional? The CP can go away at times but the evidence was read in this debate and you then become responsible. To make a CP conditional you should do this in your SPEECH not CX. The conditional capture: UTOPIA. This should be discused. The implications of arguing that something is bad and also saying that if we lose that argument "we will capture" because it is advantage should be argued by the team that is the potential victim. If you choose not to be prepared to lose to UTOPIA.

DISADS I like them. They make debate fun on the negative. Yo should have specific links. Or it would not be a disadvantage. General links cause trouble with uniqueness of current decisions. The negative better win a disadvantage or I will compare the statu quo with the plan and the status quo without the plan. The old significance standard debate is not compelling. This topic ca for a look at very abstract issues. (something is better than noth as long as there are no DAs.)

MISC Sometimes I will miss things (but who doesn't?) Just do the best to minimize the things that can be missed. ALSO, I give alot of nonverbal feedback(try to use to make the debate better.) if you are not seeing any just go on, EVERYTHING IS PROBABLY OK.

Judging Philosophy Statement
1987 CEDA National Tournament

NAME: Gary Horn

SCHOOL: Ferris State College, Big Rapids, Michigan

YEARS JUDGING: 20 ROUNDS JUDGED ON THIS TOPIC: 35

I consider myself an issue judge and feel that you must win the critical issues to win the debate. Issues are won with excellent arguments and quality evidence. My role then is to weigh everything presented in the round by both teams and come out with a justifiable decision. I do not take this task lightly.

The affirmative team has an easy time establishing a prima facia case with me unless the negative argues it in such away that the affirmative can't extend or the affirmative position is just completely out of the ballpark dealing with the resolution. Topicality is an area where I am very liberal and usually consider it a wasted argument. I find most teams I have heard this year have a great deal of respect for topicality and just play pretty straight. I hope my luck continues.

The negative team must clash and apply arguments to the affirmative they are debating. Generic value objections are acceptable as long as they are applied and not just put on the flow to fill time. My reaction to wild and crazy value objections (growth, beef, and nuke war) is don't waste your breath in my round. If you cannot very clearly link the value objection then do not use it.

In the area of evidence, I will get involved only to the degree that the teams point out questionable authorities or statements. If evidence challenges are not cleared up to my satisfaction by the end of the round, I will call for the evidence.

The style and delivery that I like to see employed is one that communicates clearly with every member of your audience. You gain nothing by screaming at me, being rude, or going so fast that you become incomprehensible.

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY OF JACK H. HOWE, CAL.ST.U.-LONG BEACH

As a founder of CEDA, I still believe very strongly in the style of debate we sought to establish sixteen years ago. What I hope to hear in a CEDA debate is communicative persuasive delivery, the use of evidence to prove points (but not to the point that evidence-card reading becomes the focal point of the entire contest, and argumentation that assumes the judge is a person of reasonable common sense who will not appreciate arguments that extend into the realm of fantasy. Above all, the debate should be one that a normally intelligent audience, an audience without extensive information on the topic, could follow and from which they could leave hoping to beable to hear another debate some day. Jargon, excessive speed, fanciful value objections designed purely to cause the opposing team to waste time, all these are aspects of debate which I abhor.

I expect an Affirmative team to assume a fair Burden of Proof in the debate and not seek out some unduly restricted interpretation of what that Burden is. Our topic is, of course, a value one, and thus there is no place in these debates for Plans or Counter-Plans.

In regard to evidence, I expect all debaters to remember that opinion evidence is only as good as the individual offering the opinion. Authorities must be qualified if their testimony is to be given any credit. Merely stating "Smith says" and then reading a quotation is pointless; for all we know "Smith" could be another debater on the speaker's squad and in no way entitled to speak on the topic. Likewise, if journals or newsmagazines are cited as the authorities the date should be given to indicate that it is recent, and remember also that law reviews do not write their own articles, some human being has to have done it and presumably the article included that person's name.

Judging Philosophy Statement
1987 CEDA National Tournament

John E. Humphreys

University of Arizona

Years Judging: 8 Rounds Judged on this topic: 25

PARADIGM: The decision in any debate is based on the arguments that are applied by the debators to the following areas. The judge's role is to objectively record these applications and decide which side prevails based entirely on what was said in the debate. Thus the importance of many of the elements below are subject to discussion in any one round. There are few rules in debate, thus involved theory analysis aimed at establishing guidelines and that provide the underlying rationale for the concepts being employed is both educational and intresting. Quoting Yearbooks to indicate how some one else would judge the debate is annoying and useless; no evidence is necessary for a properly developed theory argument.

AFFIRMATIVE: The prima facia burden is threefold:

(1) TOPICALITY-IS A VOTING ISSUE. Contextual definitions are always prefered and "trick" definitions are seldom successful. Definitions should exclude as well as include certain areas as ground for the debate.

(2) JUSTIFICATION- This requires that appropriate definitions and criteria be established and applied in the 1AC. These elements determine the burdens for the aff speech

(3) NO SHIFT- The aff. is stuck with the original posation and can not win on turn arounds (etc) alone.

NEGATIVE: Beware that presumption, as well as the degree of significance necessary to overcome it, is subject to argument in the debate. The negative can win the debate by indicating that the aff has failed to meet thier burdens without any "U.O.'s" ; however these can be helpful since most rounds involve a weighing of significances. Counter intuitive positions that reasonably apply are fine but the more tenuous/protracted the links and exaggerated the impact the more doubtful the position. The legitimacy of conditionality is open to discussion; evidentary contradictions are always fallacious.

EVIDENCE: Complete citations must be available on demand but not read each time. Only evidence involved in an ethical concern will be reviewed after the round. Evidence is to be evaluated and interperted by the debators in the round. Consistent over extrapolation of the evidence is Heinous.

STYLE: The debator must be understandable and coherent. No extra effort will be employed to keep up with one who blithers. Cross-Exam. takes on its only significance when it is employed in the actual speeches. I prefer analytic rounds to ones that contain an overabundance of non-applied and/or non-applicable quotations.

NAME: Edward S. Inch
SCHOOL: Pacific Lutheran University

Years Judging: 6 Rounds judged on this topic: 23

1. Paradigm. I think the judge acts as an observer and final decision-maker in the round. If arguments, standards, and decision-rules are clear, the judge should try not to interject independent issues not advanced in the round. To do so, in my view, asks the participants to read my mind. However, the less clear the round, the more the critic must interpret the arguments. Decision-rules, criteria, and standards must be well reasoned and proved. I don't like quick tag arguments. When the round is unclear, I will tend to decide the issues based on who persuaded me with the best quality arguments. And, left to my own devices, I will tend to look for the real-world ramifications and effects of accepting the values argued. I will not vote for arguments which are counter-intuitive unless exceptional evidence is presented proving their validity. I am not fond of silly, time-wasting arguments.

2. Affirmative. The affirmative must present a prima facie case. It must have criteria which are proved, and an application of the criteria to the resolution. The case must be reasonably topical, and I consider topicality an important, voting issue.

3. Negative. I am not adverse to counter warrants or counter values or counter criteria. With appropriate justification for the strategy, any of these are a good if not preferable approach to the resolution. The key is appropriateness. I expect a negative to provide a rationale for the strategy and to argue standards for decision. I have no difficulty with conditional arguments, and presumption rests with the side advocating least change.

4. Evidence. Evidence is part of an argument, it is not the argument. I expect debaters to use evidence to establish and prove their claims. I do not require teams to read complete citations in the round, but they should be available to the other team and the critic. I seldom read evidence after the round, it should be communicated clearly enough to the audience. I will read challenged evidence but not poorly read evidence.

5. Style and Delivery. Cross examination should set up arguments, not make them, and it should be used to supplement speeches. Fast delivery is not my favorite, but it doesn't bother me much. I enjoy teams that clearly develop and extend arguments which reflect real consideration about the issues. I enjoy well planned and developed debates.

6. Other. I am very open with regard to the arguments I accept. I think the debaters should be in control of their own destiny and should argue what they feel best defends their positions. Above all, however, I want clarity.

Mary Ives
UC Berkeley
4 yrs judging

... on this topic: [redacted] 58

1) I'm a tabula rasa judge; this, however, doesn't mean I'm gullible. But I will accept almost any arguments as long as the links and the evidence are there.

2) Affirmative - I do feel that the Affirmative has certain Prima facie burdens in CEDA - esp topicality. And I'm fairly liberal about the range of possible Affirmatives that can be run.

3) Negative - I do believe that the Negative has the burden of "casting doubt" upon the Affirmative case. If the Negative team can cast enough doubt to make the round a tie, then it'll most likely be a Negative ballot.

4) As a judge I'll accept counter-intuitive arguments - even if I personally think they're bogus - as long as the links are clear and the evidence is credible and contextual.

5) I want both evidence and analysis - I am not persuaded by one extreme or the other. I don't need full source cites or qualifications after the first mention, but I expect them to be there if I ask for the evidence after the round.

6) Style & delivery - Speed is no problem - you may go as fast or as slow as you need. I really dislike rudeness to either the other team or the judge. Rudeness is unnecessary and makes the round unpleasant for all involved.

CEDA Judging Philosophy
for Capt Bruce L. Jeffrey
United States Air Force Academy

My experience with judging debate has been short in time, but full of learning. Here's what I explain to most teams prior to starting a round:

1) I didn't debate in college and although I've learned enough to keep me out of trouble with normal debate procedures, I still can't go at Mach 3 on the flow.

2) In other words, I like a reasoned, slow round. I prefer quality over quantity and good analysis over the preponderence of evidence. The "splatter" technique (throw out a zillion pieces of evidence and hope something sticks) won't work with me. If I don't understand it, I can't vote on it.

3) I expect full source cites: name, date, article, and page number. I read it only if it is indicted by the other team. I expect teams to have good cause to indict evidence.

4) I expect affirmitive to establish clear criteria for me to judge the round: what needs to happen for me to vote aff, what needs to happen for me to vote neg.

5) Neg may challenge criteria, but I expect them to give analysis as to why their criteria is better.

6) I expect cross-examination to concentrate on clarifying issues or statements contained in the previous speech, not to ask for future arguments. I dislike abusive and evasive tactics.

7) I like humor and analogies.

8) Don't feel like you have to take everything to a communist takeover to win my vote. I hate being stereotyped as to how I think. If you can show the links that testing is necessary because all Air Force officers are crackpots and you need to test because they're a threat to world peace and personal happiness, fine. I may nuke your town afterwards, but I'll give you the round first.

Bruce L. Jeffrey

BRUCE L. JEFFREY, Capt, USAF
Assistant Director of Forensics

Glenda Jenkins
University of North Carolina-Charlotte

Years Judging: 3
Rounds with topic: 31

My role as a debate judge is to evaluate arguments made in a round by the debators. I judge a debate round on the basis of what each team decides should be voting issues. It is very helpful if a citeria or decision rule is set up for me to decide by. If no such criteria is set up, I weigh Aff. impacts versus Negative impacts. Of course, the impacts must have a link to the topic or to the Affirmative case before I will consider them. And the links should be debated by both teams in the round if they choose to do so. I will also evaluate the importance of one value over another by the arguments given in the round. I have no objection to debators using theoretical arguments to set up a decision rule or criteria. The Neg. can either accept Aff. criteria or debate the validity of these theoretical arguments. If Neg chooses to do this, they should then set up criteria they feel is better.

The only prima facia requirement I impose on the Aff. team is topicality. I let the debators decide if any other issues are prima facia requirements. I tend to be very liberal on topicality. I believe that an Aff. merely has to be reasonably topical. But again this must be debated in the round.

I do not mind counter warrants but again the validity of such arguments is determined by the teams' arguments in the round. Persumption always lies with the status quo whether that be Affirmative or Negative. To overcome persumption the opposing team must show that they significantly outweigh the other team. Significance can be qualitative or quantitative and how much sign. is needed must be debated in round. Counter intuitive arguments can be made in a round and I judge them as I would any other argument. I look at the argumentation of both sides and determine its validity.

Evidence plays a very important role in my decision. I believe that most arguments should be supported with some type of evidence. A press by one team or the other does not require evidence and some arguments may be made from logic. But the validity of an argument is greatly improved by the use of evidence. A team does not have to read complete cites. A name and a date is sufficient. If the evidence is questioned however, I do expect the team to be able to give full cite of source and qualifications of source. I weigh conflicting evidence by debators argumentation on validity or quality of evidence. If no such arguments are made, I will look and decide on the preponderance of evidence. If neither teamhas a preponderance of evidence, I will decide by looking at date and quality of source. The only time I will call for evidence is if one team argues the card is out of context or does not say what the team claims it to say and it is an important argument in the round.

Cross examination should be used to clarify, to point out flaws or to set up opposing arguments. The one who is the questioner should ask questions in order to fulfill the above and should not try to make arguments or statements. They should be made in the next speech.

Delivery will not influence the final decision of the round, but will be considered when assigning speaker points. At no time in the debate should the debators be extremely rude, there is no reason for this type of behavior. An extremely rude debator will be punished by low speaker points. I like for the debators to argue issues not the opposing team's looks, intelligence, etc. I do not mind a fast delivery as long as the debators are comprehensible and the opposing team can understand the arguments being made.

CEDA Judging Philosophy
Scott Jensen
Central Missouri State University

My feeling is that the role of the debate judge in the CEDA round should be controlled by the debate teams in the specific round. The uniqueness of CEDA is that the debate deals with more abstract and subjective elements than policy-type debates. To that extent, I will make use of whatever criteria is offered by the affirmative. Of course, the negative is always welcome to offer counter criteria, and I respect that option. However, should this occur in a round I am judging, the affirmative's criteria must be indicted, and the counter criteria must be justified for the round. Also relating to this, there must be a value that is weighed with the criteria. I see this as an extremely important element in the debate. Should a criteria not be offered, I will use an on-balance measure of the arguments in the round. If this value/criteria is not presented by the affirmative, and the negative presents a prima facia challenge on the basis of this failure, I will consider the challenge a voting issue.

Relating to the above statements, I feel the burden of presenting a value and criteria is a prima facia burden. Likewise, the affirmative stand must be based on a significant area of the resolution. I am not necessarily suggesting a purely wholistic approach. However, if a minute subject area is being argued, significance must be substantiated in order to justify the limiting. In this sense, I will vote on topicality if it is proven that the affirmative has unfairly limited the topic. For those topicality arguments based on definitions, an alternate term must be presented as the topicality challenge is made. If this is done, I will consider the topicality argument based on definitions a voting issue.

Presumption is an issue that floats in the round. The team that can best substantiate the value and meet the criteria is the specific round is the team to which I will assign presumption. In other words, I question its role in the debate. I do agree, however, with the notion that values are dictated by the population to which they are concerned. I feel that off-case arguments presented by negative speakers should be based upon alternate values or criterion. My feeling is that, if affirmative paradigms are not indicted in first negative, counter-values or value objections become minimized in their applicability to that round. Counter-warrants can be presented, but should be justified in their relevance to the topic in a wholistic sense. I do not agree with a negative spread designed solely to pose difficulty in coverage for the first affirmative rebuttal. That does not mean that several arguments cannot be presented in this negative block, only that the arguments must show relevance to the round.

I would also mandate full source cites for evidence read in the round. If I don't know who said it, when, or in what, I can't very well weigh it with other evidence read. I will call for evidence, but only when it plays a crucial role in the round. Where evidence pertaining to debate theory arguments is concerned, the credentials of the source are important to me, as well as the methods used to draw conclusions in the source.

In terms of style, I believe debaters should be able to communicate. This does not mean that speed should be abandoned, only that is should not supercede articulation, clarity, explanation and structure. If I can't understand what is said in a speech, or in a piece of evidence because of an unintelligible delivery, I can't, and won't weigh it in the round. Cross examination is very important as well. It should fulfill a role of providing information to debaters, as well as to set up arguments for later presentation.

Thomas E. Jewell
University of New Mexico
9 years judging
120 rounds judged this year

1. **Paradigm**: I attempt to be as objective as possible when judging debate. I am not tabula rasa, however, since I will not vote on an argument that is patently silly just because it is "dropped." On the other hand, my tolerence level is fairly high. I won't dismiss an argument as silly unless, in my judgment, it is clearly so. Theoretical arguments in debate are fine but I would rather judge a debate on the issues of the topic rather than the issues of debate theory. I am a "flow" judge.
2. **Affirmative**: The affirmative is responsible for providing adequate justification for adoption of the resolution. There are two affirmative constructive speeches and I expect that justification to be fairly complete by the end of the second one. I tend to be liberal on topicality, but I will vote on it if the affirmative fails to defend adequately against it. Standards for evaluating topicality should be advanced by the negative--otherwise I will accept whatever seems reasonable.
3. **Negative**: Counterwarrants are fair game, but standards for evaluating them should be provided. I do not believe in presumption and this may be the one theoretical argument that I am predisposed against. I would rather flip a coin to decide a round rather than assume that one side or the other should automatically win. After judging many hundreds of rounds, I have yet to see a tie. Mega-trauma arguments are acceptable but I encourage teams to press links when appropriate. I tend to look for the "risk" that the impacts will occur before I examine the risk of the impacts--if the opponent to the argument gives me that latitude by pressing the links. Conditional arguments are probably acceptable, but the conditionality should be pointed out by the team making the argument before the apparent contradiction is noted by an opponent.
4. **Evidence**: Evidence is usually better than assertion. Good evidence is better than conclusionary "blurb" evidence. I do not happen to believe that just because someone finds a "great card" that it must be accepted over any press if the credibility of the evidence is questionable and adequately challenged. I seldom read evidence after a round unless I was inattentive when it was presented. If a debater thinks a piece of evidence is overclaimed or out of context, etc., she or he should point that out and give reasons for the complaint rather than saying "read this after the round." If it is an important issue, it is worth the time. If not, ... Evidence about debate theory is about as good as assertion.
5. **Style and Delivery**: Cross-examination is binding, but must be argued during speeches for me to consider its meaning in a round. I like to see a good cross-examination period where issues are refined and clarified rather than evidence and subpoints asked for. My main concern about delivery is being able to understand what is being said. I prefer to vote on issues for their substance rather than the strategy of "outspreading" a team but unless the abuse of speed makes it impossible for me to follow it is not a voting issue. When the "spread" approach is used (or abused) I tend to give a lot of latitude to cross-applications and grouped arguments. My preference is for quick but sane debating.
6. **Other**: I like smart, courteous, debating. I like good, well-reasoned, arguments and analysis. I dislike rude debaters. I dislike overclaimed evidence.

SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY
DIVISION OF PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

SPEECH COMMUNICATION
Box 2299
Huntsville, Texas 77341
409/294-1497

M. Anway Jones

CEDA JUDGING PHILOSOPHY

I. Paradigm:

First, the affirmative and negative teams must defend a philosophical system appropriate to the resolution debated. Each team must describe the nature of the philosophical system, a rationale for its use, and a demonstration that the values argued are within the context of the chosen philosophical system. Second, the teams must present consequential actions should I accept or reject either position. The consequential actions must be inherent to the value object upheld and must be in accordance with the "rightness" or "wrongness" of human conduct of their respective philosophical systems. That is to say that the affirmative and negative teams should show on balance which position produces the greatest benefit. In so doing, however, each team must demonstrate that not only are the courses of action beneficial (or detrimental), but that the courses of action are right (or wrong, as the case may be).

II. Topicality:

Topicality may or may not be an issue. The test centers on the use of the better definition emerging from a reasonability standard. Should the arguments be valid and significant within the context of the debate, topicality will indeed be considered.

III. Counterwarrants:

A better term to apply here is counter resolution arguments. They are considered in assessing the benefits and detriments to the adoption or rejection of the resolution. However, negative teams should show specifically how the counter resolution arguments apply to the affirmative case.

IV. Hasty Generalizations:

Affirmative and negative teams should avoid supporting their respective positions by using one or a few examples unless either team demonstrates that the single or few examples are significant and representative to the chosen philosophical system.

V. Evidence:

Both teams should present evidence that is valid and strongly supportive of either position upheld. Teams should avoid at all costs conclusionary evidence. Analysis and reasoning from the evidence will be the determining factor to asses the strength or weakness of the evidence used. In other words, debaters must do more that just read tag lines and documentation. Of course, all documentation should be credible information from credible sources.

VI. Delivery:

I must be able to understand and flow all debaters in order to adequately asses the argumentation in the round. If I am unable to understand or unable to flow either team's argumentation, the chances increase for both teams to be inadequately evaluated. Should either debater speak too rapidly, I will indicate that by not flowing.

Douglas Kent
University of New Mexico
1 year judging
30 rounds judged this year

1. **Paradigm**: The role of a judge in CEDA debate should be to accurately access how well arguments are presented and responded to. Arguments should be clearly stated with appropriate and credible evidence. In the absence of theoretical arguments, each side should be able to answer the other side's major points with logic and appropriate supports. Theoretical arguments are appropriate if other means of approaching are available.
2. **Affirmative**: The affirmative case needs to define that side of the resolution with all elements pertinent to debate supporting their case. I tend to be liberal on topicality, with the affirmative side being reasonably topical.
3. **Negative**: I feel counterwarrants are appropriate if justified. Presumption, on the other hand, seems to have more of a role in policy debate. Counterintuitive arguments have an important role in the establishment of links argument.
4. **Evidence**: Evidence holds and important role in establishing credibility of both sides of a debate. I expect source and author to be stated and the pertinent amount of information to be quoted. I tend to weigh evidence by its recency and level of credibility (according to author qualifications and quality of information).
5. **Style and Delivery**: Cross-examination whould include questions that probe the case as presented and demonstrate a logical flow of questioning leading to the presentation of a side's case. I expect professionalism on all levels. Additionally, each speaker should be clear enough in his or her enunciation as to be understood.
6. **Other**: In terms of likes and dislikes, I cannot emphatically enough state my adversion to what I call "sleazy" debate. I define this as a rabid disregard for ethics and the proper decorum of the event. All members should treat each other with respect and professionalism. Violation of this warning will result in significant deduction of speaker points and very possibly a loss.

Wayne Kraemer
The College of William and Mary
Nine Years Coaching
41 Rounds on This Topic

1. Paradigm. I view the role of the debate judge as a critic of argument, evaluating all the arguments and comparatively weighing them against each other. However, I have no particular aversion to adopting and judging based on a paradigm/criteria that I am effectively urged to adopt in a round. This does not give affirmatives carte blanche to define the negative team out of the round by advocating a restrictive criteria for evaluation. Theory arguments can be tedious if no analysis is applied and the application for the round is clear. Good theory arguments are fun to listen to if they provide thoughtful insight based on theory research.

2. Topicality. Negative teams that run topicality should give a standard for evaluation and distinct violations based on the standard. The topicality arguments should be specific and advanced in IN. Reasonability alone does not justify the affirmative so I guess I'm conservative in my approach to topicality.

3. Negative. Negative teams have presumption. An affirmative that runs presumption shift should have a good reason to do so. (What does it really get you in the round?) Counterwarrants are a negative option if run correctly. There is a wealth of research on this topic so negative teams that have taken the time to benefit from that research will be rewarded.

4. Evidence. Quality research and evidence are important in the decision-making process. "Best evidence" is a claim too frequently used (or rather, missapplied) by debaters in rounds. An evidence challenge is a very serious matter. Evidence that has been falisfied or deliberately taken out of context, when challenged, will result in zero speaker points and a loss. I also object to overclaiming the evidence and I expect the tag to fit the card.

5. Cross-examination. Last time I looked CEDA stood for Cross-Examination Debate Association. It is my belief that the CX period be used to clarify positions and pin your opponents to a specific stance and not merely prep time for your partner while you ask for evidence. I do consider CX answers binding. I strongly object to rude CX periods and "tag-team" questions and answers. Speaker points will refelct these dislikes.

6. Style and Delivery. I dislike mindless arguments. I know this will mean different things to different people--so apply as needed. I do not appreciate flowing 24 responses to an argument when there are only 4 different ones. I do not like a rate that prohibits understanding. I cannot evaluate what I do not understand. Excessive roadmapping which develops into an argument comes out of a speaker's preparation time. I reward and appreciate a creative and thinking debater.

Judging Philosophy Statement
1987 CEDA National Tournament

NAME: John E. Lama

SCHOOL: Hillsdale College

Years Judging: 30 Rounds judged on this topic: c.a. 25

1. Obviously, without the presence of a judge, tournament debating as we know it would cease to exist. So the judge is a decision maker. But he is also a helpful critic whose ballot comments should be relevant to the intellectual growth of the people debating. I do not personally care for theoretical arguments. However, I am keenly aware that Aristotle said "all of the available means of persuasion." Thus, I am prepared to listen to almost anything that will both enliven and enlighten the communication process.

2. I tend to be liberal on the subject of topicality, preferring to let the debaters define and delimit the parameters of argument in the course of the debate. While this includes a discussion of criteria, I've never been particularly impressed with an informative presentation regarding the rules of CEDA.

3. I happen to think the debate is more interesting if a negative does more than immerse itself in the burden of presumption. It just seems that an assertive negative armed with constructive argument is more fun.

4. Evidence plays an important part in my scheme of judging, but so does argument and analysis. I do not weigh evidence on a scale. Too much of that reduces debate to a mere counting of manhole covers. Nor do I see any need for a complete cite. Paraphrase it. Qualitatively, an evidence push can be exciting. I generally don't read evidence after a round, but I would not hesitate to do so if I were convinced that there was some question regarding accuracy or efficacy.

5. Cross-examination should be used to pinpoint the areas of disagreement and to diminish an opponent's case or strengthen one's own. Used well, things can happen much more rapidly in cross-examination than in the constructive speeches.

6. My full-time employment is in the Public Relations Department of Michigan's largest utility. In this capacity I train company spokespersons and make a considerable number of presentations myself. For this reason, rightly or wrongly, I place a premium on delivery. I accept as an article of faith the studies which indicate that much of what is stored in the human brain is data that is received visually. In short, as one who makes his living in communication, I fail to see the persuasive potential in a rate of speaking which approaches 600 words per minute.

William Jewell College
Liberty, Missouri 64068
(816) 781-3806

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION
Debate/Forensics
Interpersonal Communication
Journalism
Oral Interpretation
Public Relations
Radio
Speech Education
Theatre

Gina Lane
William Jewell College
6 years judging experience
32 rounds on this topic

1. Paradigm: I am probably best known as a critic of argument. I listen to the arguments both sides present, look at the quality of the support which is offered, and vote for the team which does the best job. If a team wants to offer theoretical positions which they believe should be used as eavluative criteria for the round, it is up to the other team to argue against them, either with logic or with conflicting theory evidence. When this conflict occurs, it is up to each team to compare arguments and show me why their's is superior. It is not enough to simply say "we win." If you do this, I'm forced to intervene and decide for you. I'd prefer for you to reason it out instead of me.

2. Affirmative: I will not openly reject an Affirmative team without some argument from the Negative as to why I should. However, a Negative team which argues that the Affirmative case does not meet resolutional requirements or does not specifically justify the entire resolution will be on the right track. On topicality, I appreciate standards from the Negative team, but they are not prerequisites for my decision. I usually agree that an Affirmative team need only be reasonably topical.

3. Negative: I usually do not like counter-warrants unless the Negative provides a really good justification for using them. One might be that the Affirmative has offered such a narrow interpretation of the resolution that the Negative has no ground. I believe presumption lies against the resolution, which means that the Affirmative must meet specific burdens required of them by the resolution. I have, however, been known to vote for a team which argues that presumption should go to the Negative, because they supported their arguments with an intelligent rationale. I'm not too hot on conditional arguments, especially when this conditionality becomes known to us in 2AR. Counter-intuitive arguments are OK with me as long as they are relevant to the resolution.

4. Evidance: One of the greatest weaknesses I am seeing is that teams are ignoring the quality of evidence presented in the debate. Teams are arguing tag lines, not evidence. A team will be rewarded not only for questioning the qualifications of this author in general, but specifically how this author could come to this conclusion. I will examine evidence after a round if I am unsure what it says and it is important to my decision.

5. Misc: As should be evident, I have some preferences but I believe in freedom of speech for debaters. If you can intelligently justify a position in a round, I'll not let my prejudices stand in the way. As for the rate of speech, you can keep in mind that I have the capacity to write down everything you say, however, I prefer quality of argumentation to quantity. Take pride in the fact that you are here. It's up to you to keep this activity exciting and enjoyable. Good luck!!

NAME: SUZANNE
SCHOOL: SOUTHE

Years Judging:

1. Paradi
arguments. I v
most reasonable
and applicabil
weight to the p
prefer argumen
absolute destr
destruction.
judge or even
not exist in a
a construct t
evaluated. I p
the last rebu
arguments.

2. Affirm
present a pri
issue add ons i
more narrowly
philosophyical
liberal and fa
which pick a
topicality iss
topical.

3. Negati
have significa
counter warran
on a resolutio
be issued in v
theory is iss
second negative

4. Eviden
debate round
which may not
preponderance o
the source of th
after the rou
disregard confli
round.

5. Style
of my judging
debaters to re
constructives.

6. Other:
dislike growth
better than ru
examination ques
cross-examinatio
in the debate
arguments in sub

ARSON
N UTAH STATE COLLEGE

14 Rounds judged on this topic: 35

: I like to view myself as an evaluater of
te for the team who in my estimation presents the
nd cogent arguments. Thus, I weigh practicality
y of an issue while at the same time giving
ition which is the most strongly supported. I
which are "real world" and do not link to
tion of the environment or to total nuclear war
feel more comfortable being classed as an issues
times a policy maker. I believe that values do
cuum and that when determining the importance of
policy implications of that topic need be
fer teams who put the debate into perspective in
als by indicating weight and force of the key

ive/Prima Facia Requirements: Affirmative must
facia case in the first constructive but can
the second constructive speech. I tend to favor
onstructed affirmatives as opposed to general
ases. With respect to topicality, I am very
r the affirmative and seldom vote on arguments
definitions. When called upon to resolve
s I believe the affirmative must be reasonably

: I reward teams with higher speaker points who
on-case arguments. The negative may issue
if they choose because I believe that a debate
l level itself is one type of argument which can
ue debate. I prefer that any counter warrant
d in the first negative speech even though a
ay issue the specific counter warrants.
: I view evidence as extremely important in a
d often times find myself voting for the team
ave issued the most arguments but had a clear
evidence on key issues. I like teams to qualify
ir evidence and I'm more likely to read evidence
if the teams request me to do so. I tend to
ting evidence. Use of debate theory is OK in a

nd Delivery: Delivery weighs on the lower part
le. I prefer a moderately fast round and like
d quality evidence in rebuttals as well as

ebaters can run conditional arguments. I really
arguments because I think that debaters can do
old backfile evidence. I do not flow cross-
ions generally but I do think that admissions in
are important regardless if they are used later
out prefer that the admissions are made into
equent speeches.

Judging Philosophy Statement
1987 CEDA National Tournament

NAME: Harold L. Lawson, Ph.D., J.D.

SCHOOL: Emerson College, 100 Beacon Street, Boston, MA 02116

Years Judging: 25 Rounds judged on this topic: Over 25

PARADIGM

The role of the judge is to decide which team did the better job of debating and to provide a written and/or oral critique in order that the debaters may learn how to improve. I adhere to no particular paradigm but, if pressed, I would describe myself as tabula rosa with regard to subject matter and as having a bias toward a policy making/legal paradigm with regard to theory. In the absence of theoretical arguments I will tend to impose cost/benefit analysis considering both quantitative and qualitative measures for weighing the impact of an argument.

AFFIRMATIVE

If the affirmative provides some justification for the resolution or a significant example of the resolution they are prima facia, although they may not yet have fulfilled their burden of persuasion. I do not necessarily require that the affirmative be prima facia after 1 AC, but they certainly must be so after 2 AC. I expect the affirmative to be topical and I consider non-topicality to be an absolute voting issue. I find the affirmative argument of "reverse topicality" to be oxy-moronic. In resolving a topicality issue, I believe that the affirmative is entitled to any reasonable definition of the resolution. In policy debate the affirmative may define the resolution operationally. Extra-topicality is an issue, but not an absolute voting issue.

NEGATIVE

Generally, I do not buy generic counter warrants. The negative must show, through links, how adoption of the resolution, as defined and perhaps limited by the affirmative, will reasonably give rise to the disadvantage, counter value or whatever is being claimed. On presumption, there is a burden of proof (or, if you prefer, a burden of the resolution) on the affirmative team. For either team, affirmative or negative, to prove that a particular thing exists in the present situation does not necessarily prove that it should exist. Arbitrarily, then, I assign the burden of proof to the affirmative and the presumption to the negative. The negative, however, has a burden of proof with regard to its specific assertions and may abandeon its presumption as with regard to the presentation of a counter plan in policy debate. Counter intuitive arguments are acceptable if they do not absolutely insult the intelligence and common sense of the judge. Conditional argumetns, properly developed, are fine.

EVIDENCE

Evidence (which is not necessarily synonymous with quotations from any and every source no matter how biased or ridiculous), can be a critical building block in a chain of reasoning. I will, however, under proper conditions, accept totally undocumented arguments if they are predicated upon sound analysis. A reasonably adequate citation should be presented. Dingleberry in '74 is not an adequate citation. I have been known to read evidence after rounds. I might do this under any of several scenarios -- most probably if the evidence is challenged and my memory did not adequately record the specific wording. I weigh conflicting evidence according to traditional standards of qualification, consistency with common sense, etc. Evidence on debate theory is fine, but I am particularly appalled when I hear such evidence being quoted out of context.

STYLE AND DELIVERY

The role of cross examination in debate is to clarify, to refute, or to establish basis for one's own argumentative position. I do not flow questions and answers. Admissions must be subsequently used in a speech, or I give them no weight in deciding the debate. Delivery influences my judging in two ways: First, although I would be unlikely to drop a team simply for bad delivery, delivery certainly influences speaker points; Second, if a debater in seeking light speed delivery, achieves blithering incoherency, I simply will not flow him or her. If I do not flow him or her, then the likelihood that his or her arguments will prevail is not very high. The style of debate that I like is analytical and persuasive. It utilizes thought. It utilizes humor. It integrates evidence with analysis and argument. It treats me as a being subject to the traditional Aristotelian modes of proof. It makes me want to vote for the advocate.

OTHER

This particular topic is uniquely lacking in real world presumption. There is such a mixture of legal precedent with regard to privacy in general and drug testing in particular, that I am totally unmoved by affirmative or negative arguments as to which side has the presumption. I think the answer, generally, is that neither side has any real world presumption. Therefore, only arbitrary presumption and burden of proof as described above apply.

Richard Leeman
Clemson University
Years judging: 10 Rounds judged this topic: 20

1. Paradigm: The purpose of the judge is to decide who had the best arguments in the round. The purpose is not to judge who is actually correct. The judge is not there to argue the case for either team--that is what they are supposed to do. For criteria, I take what is best, not first, argued in a round. In the absence of that, I look for which value seems most important if I were to accept all the arguments as made. Theoretical arguments: if by this you mean debate theory arguments, I don't like them. I rarely vote for topicality; the purpose of the debate is to debate the issues--not to debate debate.

2. Affirmative: Prima facie arguments for this topic center on (1) do drug tests invade privacy, and (2) are they warranted or not. I do want the affirmative to stay on the topic of employees (not applicants, not athletes), and I want to see them argue convincingly (1) yes they do invade, and (2) no they are not warranted. Resolving topicality: I go reasonably, not "best" definition.

3. Negative: Unless argued otherwise, I assign presumption to the negative. I expect the negative to clash with the affirmative case, though they have some leeway to upholding the status quo in their off-case. I let the debaters argue counter-intuitive arguments, I try not to do that for them. I'll even listen to Space Nazis. I may well throw it out based solely on analysis, though.

4. I'll take good analysis over bad evidence, but I do look for arguments to be evidenced when necessary. I do not like to take debaters'"words" for anything. (As in, "Well I wouldn't feel my privacy was invaded.") I'll look at evidence if necessary to decide a point, or if I think it's been badly used. I weigh conficting evidence based on the relevant tests: recency, source, precision, context, etc. Evidence on debate theory is OK if needed, but as noted above, I'm not overly fond of debate theory arguments.

5. Style and Delivery: I'd prefer for debaters to communicate with me, I give higher speaker scores to those that can analyze and apply arguments as well as get them out. One thing I really hate is when the debater goes so fast that only the tag line is clearly stated--the evidence gets garbled. In that case I rank down on points, and I mentally don't let the argument "in the round." I'm not going to give them the tag lines if I don't get the evidence along with them. Cross-ex should only be questions and answer; it's there both to clarify the debate and to set up one's arguments.

Dick Lesicko
Macalester College
11 years of coaching

PARADIGM: I think that naive realism works well enough. Debate is an educational game and I am the umpire. I call 'em as I see 'em. I see them through the lens of someone who teaches rhetoric and argumentation for a living. I sit in the back of the room and grade arguments using the standards that are spelled out in most textbooks. The team with the better argument on the issue, wins the issue. For example, I think that the textbooks recommend that debaters explain why their argument is better than their opponents. I also think that clash is mentioned somewhere as well. I find it tough to reward people with their set-pieces.

EVIDENCE: The less intuitive your claim, the more you need evidence to support your position. In a clash between a counter-intuitive claim and a defense of a value with presumption, I am not sure the intuitive side needs cards to support their position. A poorly evidenced 7-minute argument can be shredded by analysis. I'm the sort of judge who likes to see people pass on the cards for a few crisp and cogent points of analysis. I also like to see people qualify their sources. (For some of the outlandish sources that are presented, I'd suspect you might want to do more than prove that they are gainfully employed.)

TOPICALITY: The affirmative has the right to define the terms and the negative may only object to the definitions when they are obviously either unreasonable or unfair. (In the real world, you'd be best off trying to win on both criteria.) I don't treat every topicality violation seriously because treating each whine as a voter gives the negative an unfair advantage. I tend to ignore gross examples of gamesmanship. When the affirmative has abused their right to define (a situation that presumes that they can't offer some good reasoning for their twist of the topic), then I start to consider questions of reasonability vs. better definition and broad topics vs. narrow topics. I don't think being "reasonable" does anything when the other side is contending to be "more reasonable." As for "broad" being better, I have decided otherwise. I will not change my mind in the round. I really like people to run unique cases, but I believe that there is some artistry required by the genre of the squirrel and the game works better if you perform perfectly on topicality. The game self-destructs when negatives abuse topicality as a time-suck.

HASTY GENERALIZATION: Like all "fallacies," this one matters. The resolution is a generalization. To support a resolution with a single example requires certain features be present in the example. As I see it, neither side gets much out of elongated discussions of the American and National Leagues.

COUNTER-WARRANTS: Any negative team that doesn't present warrants for testing is going to lose. COUNTERPLANS: Maybe there is a role for them. You'd need to defend the theory, but I might buy a counterplan. If testing eliminates drug use and, as a consequence, might kick in the creeping devil of Central American communism, I'd probably listen to an argument that says, "We ought to drug test, and we ought to also do _____."

THEORY QUESTIONS: If it ends in you turning the tables or doing a reductio ad absurdum, you might consider introducing them. If it ends in an onslaught of quotations from my colleagues, you are wasting your time. You will be much better off paraphrasing their reasoning than you will be spouting their conclusions.

OTHER THINGS: Ask me questions. Have some fun. Transcend your prepared arguments and listen to the other team. Don't be afraid to audible at the line of scrimmage.

BIOLA UNIVERSITY

CEDA JUDGING PHILOSOPHY FOR: Todd V. Lewis (Biola University/La Mirada, CA)

BA--Biola University (1972)
MA -Ohio.State University (1974)
PhD--Louisiana State University (1980)

13 years as Director of Forensics at Biola; Asst. Debate Coach--1978--LSU (Baton Rouge, LA)

Rounds Judged on this topic: 10-25

JUDGING PARADIGM: I am a combination of TABULA RASA and STOCK ISSUES judge. I am willing to listen to any argument and if it becomes contested I use it as a voting issue, usually. I do not like "cross applied" arguments; I prefer to see independent arguments argued on CASE and OFF-CASE sides. On this particular topic, TOPICALITY hasn't been a major voting issue, but I will consider it if the AFF offers an overly restrictive or "broadly" defined CASE structure and the NEG chooses to argue it. I resolve TOPICALITY issues with the best definitional standard and if the AFF seems reasonable and "legal" I will buy most AFF CASES. I do not like to have debaters read and argue debate text theory at me...or debate text quotes. I think the topic issues are more important than debate text procedural concerns.

AFFIRMATIVE: I mentioned my views on TOPICALITY above. I believe that AFF teams should have most of their contentions and positions presented in 1AC, but I will allow a 2AC to qualify or extrapolate positions in the event that NEG teams ask for further clarification. (In other words, 1AC is not the only speaker who can present new arguments during the constructive period.) AFF teams who give up too much in concessions to the NEG on this topic will lose.

NEGATIVE: I do not like COUNTER WARRANTS because I believe they avoid direct clash and "muddy" the debate. I believe that VOs must be objections to the resolution and not come from extra-topical planks or multi-step "links". I do not like 2NC speakers to mention anything about the CASE side; leave it for your partner in 1NR. Keep the speakers coverage separate and force the AFF to deal with independent arguments. CONDITIONAL ARGUMENTS may be argued and I will listen, but I reserve judgement to make them MOOT.

EVIDENCE: A debate without any evidence can only be won if the opposite side is non-TOPICAL and blatantly unreasonable or narrow. Most of the time a few well chosen cards are useful. I prefer a little more citation than last name and the year. I never read evidence after a round; if I can't follow it's link or hear it's communicative application it is not considered important. I commented above on my aversion to being read debate theory from texts.

STYLE AND DELIVERY: I take a good flow, but I do not like rapid fire delivery, a la NDT. I do not like to be yelled at, but I must hear you so PROJECT!! CROSS-EXAMINATION should develop material that can take on the weight of evidence and I like it when teams' refer to information they received in CROSS-X. Humor when appropriate is generally appreciated as long as it isn't cruel or in questionable taste.

13800 BIOLA AVE · LA MIRADA, CA 90639 · (213) 944-0351

OTHER COMMENTS: I think that each team and side in this debate must argue that PRESUMPTION rests with them (i.e., it just doesn't rest with one side or the other.) In case of a tie (for example, AFF carries the CASE side contentions and NEG carries the VOs OFF-CASE), I will break the tie on the basis of which argument(s) I feel carry the most weight. Teams would be wise to not just grant one whole side to win another side because the margin for victory might rest with a relatively insignifcant issue which might sway me to make a decision toward one side or the other.

I prefer specific labeling that identifies major points by Roman numeral, letter, "little numbers" and if it goes beyond that level it is too complex. I do not like debaters who in rebuttals say "next" rather than identifying where they are responding.

Do not skip back and forth on the flow. Stay in order and tell me where you are at all times.

Complex sub-structure for VOs and CASE contentions does not impress and usually muddles the debate, since neither team can get back to each specific sub-point in rebuttals.

I realize that the IAR must cover a lot of material and so I understand that speed will pick up at that speech. My preference is that "word economy" be a primary goal and not just speed for speed's sake.

Articulation and good communication skills must be used so as clearly understand each argument.

I generally use a tally method with issues to determine who wins and loses each debate. Tie breakers were discussed above.

NAME: Brenda Logue
SCHOOL: Towson State University, Maryland
Years Judging: 18 years Rounds judged on this topic: approx. 14

1. Paradigm: Since debate resolutions in CEDA have been so varied (e.g., some being quasi-policy, some being more factual), my judging paradigm is often dependent upon the resolution in question.Regardless of type of CEDA resolution, I judge the round as an argument critic and a communication professor in the unique context of intercollegiate debate. In other words, I will listen and attempt to flow REASONABLE arguments with SUBSTANTIAL evidence given my information processing capabilities (they are not infinite). Debaters should adapt to the given judge. I prefer criteria explicitly given to evaluate the "value" concept in the round, but in their absence I decide on the most rational issues presented. Decision rules in a round are not the same as criteria. When faced with two conflicting and unresolved sets of criterion(a), I most likely will opt for the affirmative's if it is reasonable and proven. Theoretical arguments are fine if they are rational.

2. Affirmative: The first affirmative must indicate and apply the criterion(a) for the value term, using sufficient amounts of evidence. I tend to be conservative on topicality, but do not like time-consuming semantic arguments. Currently,topicality does not seem to be a problem in CEDA.

3. Negative: I think if affirmatives run narrow cases, then counter-warrants are acceptable negative strategy. Presumption varies with CEDA resolutions and either team might be able to claim and take advantage of the issue. I react very negatively to "counter-intuitive" arguments; I don't flow them, let alone vote on them. As long as conditional arguments are explicitly labeled as such, I will entertain them.

4. Evidence: Sufficient evident is important to me in making a decision. I prefer full cites read initially; later references can be shortened. Yes, I read evidence after rounds to verfiy my understanding of it. Conflicting evidence is neutralized and does not enter into my decision, unless one piece is incredulous. Theory evidence is acceptable and preferred from argument scholars and/or active CEDA coaches.

5. Style and Delivery: Cross-examination is fine for clarification, and wonderful for pointing out weaknesses in argumentation. Delivery is important to me. If I can't understand it, I can't vote on it.Debaters who expect judges to keep up with them, to be as familiar with the topic as they are, to understand their truncated arguments are NOT exhibiting competency in communication. I prefer educational and communicative debate to competitive gameplaying.

6. Other: I prefer debaters who value the debate activity, who indicate a sense of the topic, who don't take themselves and the particular round as a life or death matter, who can be good sports, who are on time and set up quickly, who show respect to the judge, their partner and their opponents.

Judging Philosophy Statement
1987 CEDA National Tournament

NAME: Frank J. Lower

SCHOOL: LSU in Shreveport

Years Judging: 21 Rounds on this topic: 22

1. The role of the debate judge, I believe, is to provide an informed judgement as to what took place in the round. I base my decision on what I have on the flow and what the various debate teams have argued. I do believe the judge needs to have some basic understanding of the topic and relevant issues related thereto. I am willing to listen to theoretical arguments, flow them, and if they have emerged as important issues in the round, evaluate them in terms of logical support and evidenciary support, and appropriateness.

2. I do believe that affirmative has the initial requirement to prove the reasonableness of its case. They are obligated to support the resolution. I tend to be moderate on topicality. I do tend to listen to the best definition presented.

3. I certainly believe that counterwarrants are a logically supportable approach for a negative to use. Presumption originally rests with the negative, but may shift according to the issues. However, both sides are presumed to have the burden of proving their arguments. I will listen to all types of arguments and see how well they are applied and how well they are responded to. Again, I am willing to listen to all types of arguements, but confess that I am not as initially impressed with conditional arguments as with others.

4. Evidence is important, and there needs to be sufficient evidence to justify the argument, but I do not believe every phrase must have come from some authority. I will listen and even vote for arguments that are logically sound. I do read evidence on occasion, usually when I have some question in my mind as to what I really heard, and when the evidence is crucial to an important issue. I am not put off by having other debate authors read to me, but generally have my own considered opinion anyway, but if debaters are going to set up criteria for evaluation and so forth, they should probably provide expert rationale.

5. I believe cross examination should be used to help advance the debate. Generally, I look for the cross-ex period to clarify points and to set up later arguments. Delivery is probably the deciding difference in an otherwise even round. I enjoy observing and judging rounds that I can flow, that the issues are clearly and fully explained and developed, and that the indications of good analysis and reasoning are equally as evident as good research.

6. Controlled and modulated speech does not bother me, I do not like monotone rapid fire delivery which results in foaming at the mouth. I can understand the need in certain circumstances to be required to move along at a rapid pace, just be sure I can understand and flow everything.

Walter Ulrich
1616 Station B
Nashville, TN 37235

Thomas S. Ludlum

Capital University

Years Judging: 40 Rounds on this topic: 19

Paradigm: I really do not believe that I have one - if so it would probably be characterized as the uniqueness of CEDA debate. I am NOT a Tabula Rosa judge and I believe the other recognized paradigms are limited to policy debate except for skills and I am certainly not that.

Affirmative: I think there is no clear location of presumption in many CEDA topics including this one so I guess there are no special prima facia obligations for the affirmative. I am conservative with topicality. I want the best definition.

Negative: Counter warrants are more acceptable in CEDA debate than NDT. I do not want to hear counter intuitive arguments i.e. "Nuke War is good" or conditional arguments.

Evidence: is important I want to at least hear and understand the name and date and if its challenged I want to know the complete cite. I do not read evidence after a debate unless distortion is an issue. I really do not like to hear theory arguments. However if a team is doing NDT debating in CEDA I will listen to and accept theory argument that says spreads, speed, multiple thoughtless mindless VO's etc. are illegitimate.

Style and Delivery: Cross examination is important, admissions are binding. Its a good place to build ethos. I listen to it. I believe that debate should be a COMMUNICATIVE ACTIVITY I don't want to hear NDT debate in CEDA.

Other: The debaters who know me, know what kind of debate I want to hear and in CEDA they do that for me by and large. Those who don't know me need only ask.

Judging Philosophy Statement--1987 CEDA National Tournament

NAME: Irwin Mallin SCHOOL: Syracuse
YEARS JUDGING: 3 ROUNDS JUDGED ON THIS TOPIC: 28

1. PARADIGM: Just as surely as there is no such thing as a perfectly objective newspaper, there is no such thing as a perfectly tabula rasa debate judge. We all have our reasonable expectations and our interventionist impulses. I promise to try my damndest to supress the latter if you promise to try your damndest to respect the former, which are explained herein. (Ie, I'm tabula rasa, as limited by what you see on this page.)

2. AFFIRMATIVE: To be prima facie, aff is obliged to be topical and significant. Ultimately, though, criteria is used for what its name implies -- as the basis for judging the round. Topicality is an absolute voting issue, via whichever standard the debaters in the round persuade me is best. I've always felt that requiring aff to "prove the whole resolution" is akin to Charlie Brown's teacher telling him to "explain what caused World War II and use both sides of the page if you need to." This DOES NOT mean that I condone squirrel cases, but rather that "example" cases are fine if aff convinces me that the example is reasonably typical and within the spirit of the resolution.

3. NEGATIVE: As long as aff is topical, neg's off-case arguments should be directly applicable to (and applied to) case. Presumption is only an issue if the debaters in a given round choose to make it one. Neg is obligated to start arguing things that guide the course of the round (criteria, definitions, topicality, etc.) up front in INC, not matter-of-factly in the last 10 seconds of INC.

4. EVIDENCE: I like to see good analysis supported by good evidence (as opposed to evidence in lieu of good analysis). Evidence is what makes your arguments probative. I expect to hear full cites (including author's credentials) because they help me decide how much probative force the evidence has. The more probative of two conflicting cards is the one I buy. As I age, it becomes increasingly difficult to tell if a card says what I ... thought I heard it say or what I thought I heard its presenter say it says. As such, I reserve the right to read evidence after a round. I like well-applied theoretical arguments, and they need to be backed by evidence as much as arguments "on the merits" of the resolution do.

5. STYLE AND DELIVERY: I like to hear a relatively slow, persuasive speaking style. Such a style isn't a substitute for clash and coverage, but rather is the best manner in which to present them. Employing such a style will neccessarily help your speaker points. Additionally, since if I don't flow an argument I won't vote on it, it may affect whether you win the ballot. The premature onset of senility has affected my ability to flow. My senility also manifests itself in that I actually think debate is supposed to be fun. So I respond positively to humor, and negatively to rudeness and arrogance. Cross-ex is information gathering. That is, I don't flow it and it only affects the reason for decision to the extent that information gathered in cross-ex is used in speeches.

6. OTHER: This is a proposition of value. As such, I like to hear well-defined value clash. My other likes are pretty thoroughly noted above. My dislikes would include: underdeveloped arguments (Eg, 10 half-baked VO's in INC. Eg, tags in lieu of analysis.); Emory switch; Arguments which are obviously not understood by their presenter; Arguments with minimal causal relationship to the topic. I want to be told if Syracuse debaters do the things I don't like.

7. ONE MORE THING: This is my last tournament. Forensics people are among the finest I have ever worked and associated with. The past few years have been my pleasure, and I wish each of you God's richest blessings.

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT
1987 CEDA NATIONAL TOURNAMENT

NAME: Craig Manson

SCHOOL: U.S. Air Force Academy

YEARS JUDGING: College--2; High School--4 ROUNDS THIS TOPIC: 20

1. PARADIGM: The philosophical role of the judge I explain this way: the judge has been deputized by society to evaluate competing values and eventually to adopt, on society's behalf, the superior value(s). The judge's commission gives the judge the authority to accept values as binding for all society. Theoretical arguments can be illuminating as it is necessary for the judge to comprehend the broadest implications of the issues. Absent theoretical arguments, my main criterion measures the practical results of one position or the other.

2. AFFIRMATIVE: I am conservative on topicality. I assume that the drafters of the resolution meant the words to be given their plain and ordinary meanings. I am not usually impressed with definitions or topic interpretations that lack common recognition.

3. NEGATIVE: Counter-intuitive arguments and conditional arguments will impress me whensupported by strong logic. For negative teams to win when they propose countre-definitions or counter-criteria, they must convince me that those offered by the affirmative are either practically or inherently unreasonable.

4. EVIDENCE: A strong intuitive argument with little or no evidence, in my view, can prevail over a logically weak argument supported by much evidence. I do not require complete cites to be read in the round. I do read evidence after some rounds. Sometimes, a single piece of evidence can win or lose a round. In my view, UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES SHOULD DEBATE THEORY EVIDENCE BE READ IN A ROUND! It's a waste of time and insults the judge.

5. STYLE AND DELIVERY: I regard the erosion of persuasive style over the last decade as the most serious problem in debate. Although I am a former NDT debater myself, I dislike rapid-fire, non-communicative delivery. Non-debaters should be able to come into a round and understand every word spoken. I expect good debaters to be good speakers. Cross-ex can be as persuasive as arguments to me and should not be used merely to obtain evidence for the next speech.

6. OTHER: I am a lawyer and a law professor. I recoil at mis-stated legal arguments, but do not hold them against debaters. I have been, at different times in my career, a prosecutor and a defense attorney. I have prosecuted and defended drug cases involving urinalysis and other drug-test information. My philosophy can be summed up simply as, "The team that does the better debating wins." Although that statement may seem flippant to the casual reader, my experience has been that debaters seem to understand it.

Craig Manson

CRAIG MANSON, Major, USAF
Assistant Professor of Law
United States Air Force Academy

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT
1987 CEDA National Tournament

Scott Maurer
Years Judging: 3 (Univ level)

UAB
Rds this topic: 50+ by CNT

STYLE:

While I am capable of accomodating virtually any style, I have a preference for a style that emphasizes content rather than speed. I feel that it is the debater's responsibility to choose words carefully. If this is done, it is possible for the debater to speak at a moderate rate and still put forth an adequate amount of information. The debater should articulate. The debater should be reasonably courteous--This does not mean sickeningly sweet. Usually when one tries to make another look stupid, it backfires. Organization is an important part of a debater's style; it also makes my job a lot easier. I tend to be a fairly expressive judge, look at me and adapt. Don't keep hammering at a dumb argument if I am showing obvious disgust.

CONTENT:

Sources, in order to be considered, must be qualified. This means note (1) the author's name, (2) the author's qualifications, (3) the name of the publication, and 4) the date of publication. Illogical and down-right stupid arguments will not receive much, if any, consideration. Repetitive arguments will be considered once but not multiple times. This does not mean that debaters cannot cross-apply arguments. It does mean that I do not consider "not significant" and "does not affect many" to be two separate arguments. That is why I only flow it once. I have a basic knowledge of the topic and think, contrary to some people's beliefs, it is impossible to come into a round and forget everything in the outside world. This does not mean that I will introduce arguments into the round; it does mean that I do not accept an argument that is totally contrary to all accepted norms (yes, norms do exist). Debate should not be an exercise in the absurd. It should be an activity that teaches debaters to take a stand and defend it in such a way that real people in the real world could accept that stance. The debaters will not be punished for direct clash, even though it does seem to be becoming a more and more remote form of debate. I will reward you for it. I will vote on topicality and "prima facie" arguments. Debate theory arguments, unless there is an overwhelming need are usually a waste of time in my rounds. Good humor is appreciated.

Vince D. Maldrue
Graduate Assistant

Arizona State University
2 years of coaching
12 tournaments this year

DECISION MAKING PARADIGM: I can't really say that I require any one paradigm. I would say that if there is no paradigm argued for in a round, then I tend toward a policy making paradigm. Also, a critic of argument or style paradigm wouldn't be a persuasive paradigm for a team debating in front of me. I have at times accepted a stock issues paradigm, but I do believe that there are very good reasons to reject such a paradigm (teams would have to argue these reasons of course). Other paradigms could be argued to be effective for decision making and I would accept them. In the realm of punishment paradigms I am open, I have been known to vote for them on occasion. I also try DOT to intervene in a debate, the debate is for the students not for the coaches, but please don't expect me to accept stupidity just because you said it.

TOPICALITY: On this topic very few topicality arguments have really persuaded me. I do tend to be fairly conservative on "T", but I can't say that I have voted on it a lot.

COUNTERPLANS: I have to say that I enjoy a good counterplan. In the area of competitiveness it would be nice if the counterplan was mutually exclusive, but this is not written in stone. Conditionality is also fine by me, in fact I have been told that all arguments are conditional so many times that I am starting to believe it (it is nice when the team mentions this before they grant things out though). Permutations are an interesting idea. In order for a team to "perm" I do require that the "perm" be topical. I haven't heard anyone argue counterwarrants this year, and I doubt I would vote for one.

ADD-ONS/TURNAROUNDS/DISCO: All of these have there place and time. I can't really see the debate ending after constructives so the further development of issues is fine by me.

STYLE AND OTHER ISSUES: There is one thing that I am particularly tired of this year, that is the concept of Duo-cross-examination. If you want to do this I feel you should be in interp. Speed and etc. are fine by me, but if I don't understand you -- tough. I call for evidence if it seems important to my decision, this isn't very often. A simple tip for debaters debating in front of me, I enjoy a good debate but I dislike offensive debaters. If you do debate for me try to make the round enjoyable.

Judging Philosophy, Spring 1987

Let me say first that what follows is intended to help the debater who will be subjected to the random testing of my judgement. Since I cannot possibly foresee all the situations in which my statements herein will be utilized, I see little point in attempting to be too specific. I therefore intend this to portray broad principles I try to uphold and also attitudes I possess.

The "perfect" debate would focus upon the center of the controversy expressed in the resolution. Tangential arguments and analysis, while not irrelevant, would only weigh in the decision should the central focus get blurred. Definitions, Criteria and "Standards" would be clearly articulated in an attempt to provide a framework for debate and for judgement and NOT as an effort to deny the opposition any possible ground. I am not about to proclaim "I will never vote on . . . ," but I do believe intuitive good sense is all you need to articulate to defeat tortured logic expressed in endless subpoints.

I reluctantly agree that intercollegiate debate is a game, but I strongly believe it to be a game which should be played with integrity and the players should possess a concern for their opponent's humanity which is demonstrable. The perfect debate would find four antagonists playing hard and playing to win, but also playing with respect for intelligence and with an understanding that perfection is just as illusive in judgement as it is in performance. I would argue the name of this game is in large part, "persuasion" and I regard that as a communicative art; the ancient philosopher was right, it is beautiful and just. A good debate is a joy to witness -- debate should be FUN (tell that to a team which has just lost a break-round!).

Finally, as should be no surprise after reading the above, I subscribe to the goal articulated in the CEDA constitution where it speaks of a balance among "analysis, evidence and delivery" as being the best way to assure the long-term survival of intercollegiate debate. I truly think CEDA has recaptured some of what was lost by "brand X" debate and I think it will keep it as long as intelligent adults may listen to rounds without, as I read someplace else, "feeling pain."

Patrick H. Micken, Director of Debate, College of William and Mary

23 YEARS COACHING
31 ROUNDS ON THIS TOPIC

Name: Greg Miller

School: San Diego State University

Years Judging: 2 Rounds judged on this topic: 60

Paradigm: I see the judge as an evaluator of the issues presented in the round. Consequently, I am very tabula rasa in my orientation. I believe all issues are open to discussion (except time constraints). I also expect debaters to impact and evaluate their arguments by providing decision rules for various issues. Absent any explicit paradigmatic discussion, I would expect the negative to win something absolute or outweigh the affirmative position. Additionally, I accept and sometimes even encourage theoretical argumentation. As argued previously, I will accept virtually any issue provided the position is impacted and justified.

Affirmative: I expect an affirmative to meet the requirements of the resolution. I tend to evaluate definitions using a reasonability standard. While I have a tendency not to vote on topicality, this is not because I don't want to, but because very few negatives seem to argue topicality effectively (Standards/Violations/ Impact). Additionally, I expect the affirmative to be prima facia by setting up criteria (complete with a decision rule on how to decide the debate) and meet the criteria in any ethical way.

Negative: In some ways I see all value objections as counter warrants. Therefore, it should come as no surprise that I accept the theory and practice of counter warrants. In some ways, I would recommend calling these warrants generic value objections. Presumption is only a decision rule in the case of a tie (absent any argumentation to the contrary). I also accept conditional argumentation and counter intuitive arguments.

Evidence: Evidence plays a crucial role in my decision (this includes theory evidence). I do not require teams to read complete source cites. Moreover, I will read evidence (usually lots) after the round to resolve arguments or decide evidential challenges. However, I will not read evidence that I don't understand due to a lack of speaking clarity.

Style and Delivery: Cross-examination should be used to set up, clarify, or pin down various arguments. I will accept any rate of delivery, as long as clarity is not sacrificed. I like debaters to be aggressive and synthesize arguments in rebuttals. For example, a 2NR that tries to win everything usually ends up winning nothing.

Other: There is very little that offends me about debate. In some ways I set myself up for debate genocide, (a bombarding run of bizarre argumentation). I would ask debaters to work on clarity and specificity in rebuttals. Moreover, I will not tolerate rudeness during rounds. Teams that humiliate, or belittle their opponents will do nothing toward winning and will in fact lose the round. Other than the aforementioned positions, have fun and the best of luck.

DEBATE JUDGING PHILOSOPHY
1987 CEDA NATIONAL TOURNAMENT
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA

PATTI MILLS

I believe that debate is an invaluable tool to exercising logical thought and communication skills. Logical thought is best represented through effective, sound evidence, the credibility of which is justified through full source citation in at least the constructive arguments. A round should not, however, become a "battle of the cards". Rather, I am much more impressed with insightful analysis. I consider analysis more valuable than evidence cards because it requires the debater to apply and link evidence to specified arguments. Thus, I watch carefully for links between evidence and arguments.

I personally dislike topicality arguments. However, I feel that it is imperative that an Affirmative team structure a case that does not invite one. Topicality is on the same level as other arguments in the round and should be extended through the debate or be dropped.

In considering the communication aspect, I am obviously concerned with organization. Does the case apply directly to the resolution? Is it developed logically? Can I follow the speaker? Does the case structure allow for good, effective, direct clash? I am not at all impressed with "muddled" debates.

Delivery is my second observation. A first Affirmative who "reads" a brief to me is not showing his/her speaking abilities. CEDA is audience-oriented and the judge should be considered the audience. I realize that many competitors are using speed for the sake of speed because they think it improves their chances of winning. I feel it is unnecessary. If a case is well organized, well supported and strong analysis is applied, there is no reason for this. Rapid rates of speed when speaking are not encouraged in a court of law, on a political platform or in the classroom. There is a good reason for this. Excessive speed inhibits effective communication.

When calculating my decision, I keep in mind that there is no such thing as a perfect answer. Each round is unique and may focus on a different value. I try to determine which value has been demonstrated to be the more compelling. I take an extensive flow and do not begin to decide the outcome of a round until it is entirely over.

Scott Millsap, Florida International Univ./Univ. of Miami

Years Judging: 5 Rounds judged on this topic: 27

1. Paradigm: I attempt to be tabula rasa. CEDA judges should reward well structured, well developed arguments presented in a consise coherent manner. This means that tag and evidence debaters will not be successful since I don't consider a tag and evidence coherent argument.

2. I will not vote on prima facie burdens unless argued. I do expect 1AC to contain some mentionof definitions, criteria. I am pretty liberal on topicality (the case should have some relationship to the topic ie. refer to the key concepts at some point). Generally, topicality in value rounds operate like extratopicality in policy. I will use the standard the debaters argue and win in the round - I prefer the best definition standard.

3. I think counter warrants are proper in value debate. Presumption can be argued but it generally rests against the specific affirmative case. Counter intuitive arguments generally require less refutation to answer. Conditional argument in response to a vague affirmative position are acceptable.

4. Evidence is important but can not replace reasoning - each plays an essential role. Evidence should contain the author's analysis and not just his conclusion. The initial citation should contain author, source, date. Later references should be author, date. I will read evidence only when there is disagreement about context, or when two pieces directly conflict. I look at the accompanying analysis to weigh conflicting evidence. I will listen to theory evidence.

I have a strict standard on falsification of evidence. To make this charge the debater must have the original. The round ends at this point with the loser receiving no speaker points.

5. Cross examination is an opportunity for gathering information and mental spazing which can help speaker points - unless the participants turn ugly. Cross ex is binding unless argued otherwise. Delivery will affect the credibility of the argument. I find it hard to give much credence to either an extremely fast tag and evidience style speech or a slow rambling rhetorical discourse lacking organization.

I like sharp reasoning, analysis and wit presented in an articulate consise manner. I dislike mindless blithering at any speed and debaters who use speed as a tactical weapon.

Susan Millsap, University of Miami

Years Judging: 6 Rounds judged on this topic: 35

I am basically a tabula rasa judge. The paramaters the debaters set up and justify are the paramaters I'll use to judge the round. Since I believe that debaters help to establish theory in practice I'll listen to theory arguments in the debate. I do expect the affirmative to meet a definitive and designative burden. A criteria should be established and met. I tend to use a best definition standard.

Cases should be within the realm of the resolution as seen by a reasonable person. I do believe that topicality is an absolute voting issue. However, the negative must argue topicality before I vote on it.

Presumption can shift in value debate since all values exist in society. However, some values are more important at some times rather than others. Therefore an hierarchy argument can be used to establish presumption. Counter-intuitive arguments can be used if there are direct and clear links to the topic.

Evidence is necessary for support, however, good clear analysis is just as good as evidence. The evidence should include the analysis of the author and not just his conclusion. Complete cites should be read the first time the evidence is enetered into the round. After that an abrieveated form is acceptable. Author qualifications should be provided. I will read evidence after the round if there is doubt on its content or there is evidence in the round that directly contradicts.

I have been very concerned lately about the frequent accusations during rounds of evidence falsification or misrepresentation. For a debater to make this charge they should have the original with them. If falsification is found the round ends there.

Cross-examination should be used to clarify issues, to get a team to take a stand and to set up arguments. Too frequently this time is used to exchange evidence only. What is said in cross-ex is binding. Debaters should also remember that they are presenting the arguments to me and not the other team. Therefore, hostility in cross-ex will only hurt your credibility.

I do feel that debate is an oral activity and training ground for speakers. Therefore, I do not like excessively rapid delivery. I much prefer a round that is persuasive and analytical keeping in mind the restrictions that time limits put on the number of arguments allowed in the round.

STATEMENT OF JUDGING PHILOSOPHY

Marc T. Newman
Director of Forensics
University of California, Irvine

PARADIGM: I use a Public Speaking Paradigm. Basically this means that I like to see good public speaking and will punish if I don't see it. Solid organization of every speech, full source citation, clear arguments, and a conversational speaking style will generally result in high speaker points. I do not like speed. I do not like meta-debate (debate about debate). I do not like megapointing ("I have 47 responses!"). Let's have a clear round where the issues are argued and crystalize them for me in rebuttals, don't expand them off the flow.

TOPICALITY: I buy topicality if the team can show a clear violation.

SOLVENCY: I believe this topic to be policy-inherent and so I buy solvency arguments which are argued clearly, fairly, and reasonably.

HUMOR: It's not a voting issue....but I like it.

COURTESY: DO NOT BE RUDE! Excessive rudeness can cause you to lose a round very early in a debate. If your opponents are rude do not respond in like manner. Use humor to diffuse the situation and it will show up on speaks.

GOOD LUCK!

RICHARD O'DOR
SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE
Years Judging 15 Rounds judged on this topic 70+

1. Paradigm. I evaluate a debate on the overall validity of the argumentation. Therefore, any argument can be proposed that provides a warrant for or a counter warrant against the resolution.

2. Affirmative. Since the resolutional grounds establish the prima facia requirments, the affirmative must (1) establish the resolutional grounds or type of resolution, and (2) substantiate the validity of their argumentation supporting this type of resolution. If the affirmative does not satisfy these initial burdens, the negative can (1) opt to indict the prima facia burden or argue counter resolutional grounds that may even further restrict the validity of the original affirmative argumentation. Topicality issues are resolved by the overall validity of the arguments communicated by each team. Since standards are crucial to resolving any argument, each team needs to substantiate that their standard provides for the most valid argumentation grounds of the resolution.

3. Negative. Arguments, including counter warrants, are only restricted by the resolutional grounds and their validity to other arguments. I do not assign presumption. If a topic seems to shift presumption to the aff, the debate format should also be shifted, however, it is not. Since the specific wording of the resolution can create complications for our current speaker format, I feel that both teams have a burden of proof for their resolutional grounds and arguments. If the 1AC's initial burden is not meet, the 1NC's burden can be reduced to arguing prima faciality.

4. Evidence. Evidence is used to prove the validity of arguments. I prefer that teams read the full cite. If any evidence is questioned by either the opposing team or me, I will read evidence after a round. If any evidence is falsified, the team will forfeit the win and all points. I have never understood the practice of offering evidence only as counter evidence. If you ask me to weigh conflicting evidence but offer no standard to establish the validity of the arguments relevant to these proofs, I will be force to examine other issues that provide standards for establishing their validity. Since conclusionary evidence never provides proof of how the statement was established, I do not give much impact to argument constructed on conclusionary evidence.

5. Style and Delivery. Cross examination should be used to clarify and develop strategy for issues. Since these questions and responses should be based on emerging or ongoing issues, debaters should utilize these answers as evidence in their argumentation. I prefer the cross examination to display effective communication relevant to questions/answers--not speeches.

6. Court decisions. The best evidence in regards to a court decision is not the decision, but the validity of the arguments relevant to the decision. For example, Plessy v Ferguson decided that separate but equal educational facilities were appropriate, however, Brown v Topeka decided that separate but equal educational facilities were inappropriate. You cannot understand the validity of these decisions without analyzing the argumentation relevant to the decisions. A court decision without this analysis is just conclusionary evidence from a judical source.

Judging Philosophy Statement
1987 CEDA National Tournament

NAME: Sean Patrick O'Rourke

SCHOOL: Whitman College

Years Judging: 6 Rounds judged on this topic: c. 40

1. APPROACH: Intercollegiate debate is, or at least ought to be, an educational experience, the primary goal of which is to prepare students to be effective, eloquent, ethical arguers. Hence my role as critic is to promote the above type of communication. Debaters should, therefore, strive to present well-supported, well-reasoned, and well-styled arguments designed to persuade me to vote in their favor. Additionally, debate SHOULD NOT BE separated from the world of social affairs for which it is preparation. I do, therefore, bring with me into the round my experiences, senses of what is reasonable, plausible, possible, and preferable. I WILL NOT judge a round in an intellectual vacuum.

2. AFFIRMATIVE: The affirmative's burden is that of persuasion. The burden of persuasion includes the burden of prima faciality and of advancing the evidence. A prima facia case is one in which the affirmative establishes reasonable criteria for judgment, articulates the value or values supported, and presents a reasonable, plausible representation of the topic (i.e., regulations mandating drug testing) to be evaluated. I am willing to listen to almost all topicality arguments, though "effects-topicality" is a tough argument to win on my ballot. The burden of advancing the evidence merely means that the affirmative must support its claims with strong evidence.

3. NEGATIVE: The negative's burden is also that of persuasion. Presumption, therefore, can be argued in the round. Counter-warrants, counter-values, and value-objections are all legitimate negative strategies, so long as they are issued with the appropriate elements (e.g., links). As to "counter-intuitive" arguments: let's hear 'em (and what is so counter-intuitive about "growth is bad" anyway?).

4. EVIDENCE: Evidence should be read clearly and persuasively, should be adequately documented (though there is no need to go to extremes), and should support the claim statement it is meant to support. Yet remember, evidence alone does not an argument make. Too, I do not vote on quantity of evidence. Falsification of evidence is an ethical violation.

5. STYLE & DELIVERY: Cicero held, and I agree, that delivery is the dominant canon of rhetoric (not the most important, but the most dominant). I urge you to use persuasive, eloquent delivery. Too, be professional and pleasant.

6. OTHER: Have fun and help me to enjoy the round. You may be interested to know that I have a J.D.

ARIZONA STATE
UNIVERSITY TEMPE, ARIZONA 85287
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION (602) 965-3085

CLARK OLSON
DIRECTOR OF FORENSICS

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
8 YEARS 12 TOURNAMENTS

DECISION-MAKING PARADIGM:
I am a die-hard stock issues judge, I prefer to evaluate debates in this paradigm. Hence, Negative teams need merely adopt an "anti-affirmative" approach as I will willingly cast a ballot on significantce, solvency, and/or inherency. This year, significance seems to be an under-used issue to win debates. Issue oriented decision-rules are appreciated. We select a topic for a reason, and I react negatively to teams who try to avoid debating the topic or drudging up old generics. I place a high premium on clash. Consequently, I rarely vote on involved theory arguments unless they are really astounding or badly mishandled. I have never cast a ballot on a reverse-voter and doubt that I would, the argument wastes time and confuses rounds. Large impact disadvantages do not substitute for links. Just because Negative teams claim huge impact does not mean there is a likelihood of the disad occurring, so link presses are effective. I try not to intervene in debate rounds, but I am human.

TOPICALITY:
I will ballot on topicality and have done so frequently this year. Well developed and extended extratopicality, and effects arguments are likewise successful. Debaters can set the standard for definitions in the context of any round. Don't run topicality unless you mean it, if you really believe topicality is a jurisdictional issue of utmost importance, it should be treated as such. Don't use it to draw Affirmatives from their case and your other arguments.

COUNTERPLANS:
Counterplans are fine, but I have an adverse reaction to hundreds of subpoints on competitiveness and topicality. Topical counterplans are further justifications for the resolution. Competitive counterplans must obtain the same advantage as the Affirmative. Several counterplans this year make better disadvantages. I never have, and chances are, never will, liked counterwarrants since they subvert clash.

OTHER STRATEGIES:
Add-ons can be a good strategy, particularly if run to make a counterplan noncompetitive. But in and of themselves, they should be unnecessary. Turnarounds and case flips too often aren't. I prefer to vote on the significance established in 1AC. Don't overuse turns or they lose impact; they usually require a thorough explanation and clear evidence. 2AR is limited to the arguments in 1AR or those dropped by the Negative in prior speeches. Disco can be fun, but is often not done well. Don't oversimplify the thesis of the arguments. I'd prefer debaters to point out contradictions when they first exist.

EVIDENCE:
I'm getting very tired of power tagged evidence, debaters seem to prefer the evidence to do the debating for them. You lose credibility and points if you misinterpret evidence. Evidence challenges are grave, a team must explain, prove and sustain such a challenge. I may ask for evidence after the round, but prefer not to keep the debate as clean as possible.

STYLE:
Speed is not an excuse for incomprehensibility, it's your responsibility to make sure I understand your arguments, otherwise I won't vote for them. Isolate what you believe to be the voting issues in rebuttals and explain why they are important, don't leave me with a mess to figure out on my flow. Cross examination should be used strategically, it's more than an extension of prep time. Partners must not answer questions, know the answers or you look stupid. Attitude plays a vital role in success, we are all humans trying to enjoy the same activity, do your best to make it fun for all of us!

1) My basic theoretical judging paradigm would probably be labeled "tabula rosa," though I dislike such categorizations. Seems it usually boils down to an on-balance approach, based on best defended (if any) criteria offered in the round. I like theoretical arguments as long as I'm not lectured that I must vote in a specific way.

2) Prima facie requirements include adequate definition of terms, reasonable criteria, and proof "on face" of the major contentions. I tend to be conservative in relation to topicality and feel that the affirmative case can exemplify a reasonable, significant, and representative sample of the topic.

3) I enjoy effectively argued counter-warrants and will consider their impact in the round. Call it a policy "NDT" holdover, but I always assign presumption with the status quo (present legislation, prevailing attitude/opinion, etc) regardless of whether the affirmative or negative team is defending present policies.

4) Evidence is used to support claims and verify facts, therefore (and especially when pressed), it plays an important role in the round when preceded by solid analysis. When there is a dispute over evidence and it is something I did not catch or have not read before (which is seldom), I

will ask for cards after the round. When presented with conflicting evidence, I follow the best analysis given in the round. With no analysis, the evidence will cancel each other out.

5) Cross-Examination's purpose is to clarify arguments and evidence for the other team and the judge. I dislike the use of cross-ex simply for the purpose of setting-up offcase arguments with hypothetical examples. Delivery influences ethos which influences every judge. I enjoy traditional good delivery characteristics: enunciation, vocal variation, authoritative tone, etc. Rate, on the other hand, is not an issue as long as one is understandable and there is a reason for the speed. I like the well-reasoned, logical style supported by solid analysis and evidence. Although I vote on the basis of my flow, such things as style, delivery, eye contact, appearance, etc. affect my perception of arguments/issues as they do every judge. It's only a matter of determining what specific style, delivery, and approach appeals to the specific judge.

David L. Painter
University of West Florida
Two years judging CEDA debate and two years competing
Forty-three rounds judged on the 1986-87 second semester topic.

DALLAS PERKINS, Harvard College, Twelve years coaching, judged 75 rounds, 15 tourneys
1987 NDT

I will begin with an abbreviated version of last year's diatribe. It seems silly to spend so much time and effort on these statements of judging philosophy when the vast majority of them begin by reciting some disclaimer of any genuine authority, stating that all theoretical issues are to be resolved by the debaters. The debate coaches at this tournament are among the smartest critics of argument, and very well trained for their task. Why they should feel compelled to abdicate to the debaters in this area of their expertise to the same degree as substantive issues where they presumably lack expertise escapes me.

My feelings about theory debates are well known: they are a waste of time, usually deteriorate to an exchange of meaningless tag lines, have no value as truth seeking, are counterproductive as attempts to learn about decision theory, and discriminate against younger teams in favor of more seasoned sophists. Accordingly, when I think that a theoretical issue is relatively clear, I will not be persuaded by arguments about it in a debate round. I will be bound by any agreement among the two teams if both wish to debate under a different theoretical regime, but as long as one team insists on my rules, they govern. A partial list of such issues follows. However, since it may be incomplete, and is undoubtedly unclear in places, I will always welcome questions before a round begins, and I will try to clarify my position.

Conditional arguments are unacceptable. Conditionality is present when one team claims the right to drop an argument on its own initiative and no longer be responsible for its implications in the round. Prime example is the conditional counterplan, but alternative justification, non-intrinsicality arguments against disads, and several other strategies are similarly suspect. The point of the phrase, "on its own initiative," is that the team is allowed to concede arguments advanced by the opposition in order to render some of its own arguments irrelevant. Concessions of extratopicality of part of a plan, topicality of all or part of a counterplan, or that there is no link to a disad, effectively remove those arguments from the round, while leaving the conceding team the right to defend its other arguments. In the case of a conceded counterplan (topicality, competitiveness, etc.), the negative reverts to a defense of the status quo. This formula makes both teams responsible for the arguments they advance: the team who advances an argument, and the team who presses the links.

Topicality is a votingissue against the affirmative. Standards are debateable, but the presumption is that the affirmative need only be reasonable. Most standards debates are irrelevant to my decision on topicality.

Counterplans must be superior to either the affirmative alone or in combination with all or any parts of the counterplan. They must be in INC if they address advantages or arguments in the 1AC. They may be topical to the extent that they address the issues raised in the 1AC, clash substantively with the affirmative case, and do not involve superior implementation of the same policy as the affirmative. Counterplans should be germane to the affirmative, and are subject to attack if they are far less realistic than the affirmative plan. This is debateable.

The affirmative plan must be a definite policy system. Provisions which involve the team or the judge choosing something "optimal" at the end of the round are unacceptable. THE AGENT OF ADOPTION MUST BE SPECIFIED, or it is not sufficiently subject to debate and evaluation. The failure to satisfy this standard in the 1AC is not fatal if it is corrected the first time it is questioned in cross-ex. But if the 1AC refuses to specify an agent in cross-ex, an attempt by the 2AC to do so after the negative attack is clear will not be acceptable.

Delivery must be comprehensible. If I cannot understand something, I will not read it after the round, and I mean it. If I cannot understand you, I will either bang my pen on the table or yell out "too fast."

Miscellany: Tag team is fine with me. Discos of large proportion are suspect in 2AR if there is no warning in 1AR. Fabricated evidence is a voting issue if intentional, though I believe good sports would simply ask the opposition to withdraw the card. There is no other practice which warrants the punishment of automatically dropping a team, especially no "abuse" of theory. I merely disregard such insults to this activity and my intelligence. If the negative wins by putting out more junk that the affirmative can cover and going for the part which is inadequately dealt with, but lacks any coherent position, I will vote negative, but their points will be no higher than 52 or 53. I take a lousy flow, no numbers, not all the lables. Try to slow down and make your lables exceptionally clear if you think it is important for me to get them.

In evaluating big disads with very thin links, I find myself more and more tending to vote negative if the affirmative has only trivial case significance, but affirmative when the case is highly significant.

NDT

1987 JUDGING PHILOSOPHY

Dr. Sharon Porter
Northern Arizona University
24 years experience

Any viewpoint that I subscribe to is arguable in a round. A debate is between teams, not a choice of 'right or wrong'. Thus, the debaters have a responsibility to provide a rationale for any position they wish me to consider. In this forum the purpose of such advocacy should be a comparison of one position and another. The ultimate burden of both teams is clash and it is the duty of the debaters to use comparative analysis in rebuttals, along with a reasoned basis for those comparisons. I will view the debate from any decision criteria presented, won, and/or agreed on by the debaters. Left to my own devices I will analyze the round by deciding who won the major policy issues. I am more persuaded by real world logic and argument than by trickery or generics.

Topicality can be successfully argued as a voting issue and thus can win my ballot. However, because topicality is frequently poorly argued, confused and muddled, I appreciate efforts toward clarity. I do exercise a 'common sense' evaluation of this particular issue. As an 'intermediate buffalo' I will still vote on significance, inherency, and solvency. As with any argument, the debaters should set standards for these issues and justify those standards. Impacts should also be explained: 'A prima facie issue' is a label not an argument.

I enjoy hearing counterplans and consider them a viable strategy. Aside from the fact that they should be nontopical and competitive, I assume no requirements for counterplans unless they become issues in the round.

The burdens of a turnaround, as with all arguments, are that they are clearly constructed and follow a logical development. For me, an add-on is just what the title implies -- an <u>added</u> reason to vote for the affirmative. If advanced seriously both issues assist the affirmative position but unless I am presented with a valid reason, not justification alone for voting affirmative.

I STRONGLY believe debating should be a pleasant, mature, learning experience for all concerned. The ability to articulate is crucial to my ability to assess the round in your favor, and should be a constant consideration (as should demeanor). Speed does not bother me; incoherence does. An unheard argument is an unmade argument. CX is binding only when brought into the constructive speeches. I do not call for evidence.

I like logical arguments and despise generics that are either tenuously or not at all linked to the affirmative. I have judged few rounds on this year's topic. Therefore, I will not understand issues (nor will I attempt to understand them) unless they are coherently expressed in the round.

I DO NOT FLOW NUMBERS OR SOURCES. I DO NOT PULL NUMBERS/SOURCES. I DO NOT CARE WHAT NUMBER/SOURCE IS DROPPED. When debating for me refer to the arguments and/or extention. Since I believe debate to be concerned with ARGUMENT a failure to refer to same will result in my ignoring the point.

Judging Philosophy Statement
1987 CEDA National Tournament

Name: C. Thomas Preston, Jr. Rounds Judged on This Topic: 25

SCHOOL: UM-ST. LOUIS Years Judging: 8

1. Paradigm: I feel that although debate judges admittedly bring their own individual set of experiences into a round and that these perceptions affect decisions, I feel that debates should be judged based on what the speakers actually say. Although I am not one to count which teams have the most arguments made last at the end of the round, I will vote on key drops. I reject radical interventionist judging and will not make an argument for one. In CEDA I judge by the decision rules and paradigms best implied by the team that makes the best arguments for them. In the absence of such arguments, I apply whatever I feel appropriate for the given round, so I expect paramount values and criteria by which to weigh them spelled out for me, especially with this semester's topic. Although I don't like debate that is "top-heavy" with theory, I find it necessary for most affirmatives to run 2-3 minutes at a minimum of theory on this semester's topic (privacy versus safety and life seem to be key issues) and for the negatives to present counter-criteria--I observe few negatives this semester winning by affirmative criteria, and vice versa.

2. Affirmative--What is prima facie in CEDA is as debatable as what type of topics we offer. On topicality, I apply the "better definitional standard," which is more stringent that "reasonableness" but not as strict on the affirmative as "best definitional." But if negative argues theoretically that "best definitional" is the standard to apply and wins it, I will apply that standard. Topicality may or may not be a reverse voting issue for the affirmative. Again, in gross debate

3. Negative--In terms of the negative, I will listen to theory arguments either way on counterwarrants. As long as debaters effectively signpost, I have no problem with off-case arguments in first negative, as long as some attempt is made at comparison/application with case. In terms of presumption, "She/he who asserts must prove." I affix a psychological presumption to the best structured arguments. If a team does not object to a "counterintuitive" argument (by dropping it), then why should I object? Counterintuitive arguments must be responded to, but are often dismissed by two or three well-chosen words. Responses to these need not belabor the obvious. If argued properly conditional arguments are cool.

4. I don't count cards, and judge evidence on quality. I require complete cites (author, title, date, qualification), but subsequent cites of a source may be abbreviated (author in date). I don't read evidence after rounds, so debaters should make sure I get it the first time. Evidence on debate theory is not gospel but I will listen.

5. Cross-ex sets up arguments, and does not make them. I like a persuasive delivery--effective delivery and word economy should enable to debater to appeal to both flow and lay judges without appreciable change between rounds. I am a flow judge--If I can't get it down you may as well have not said it.

6. I like the debaters who can most effectively choose the key voters in rebuttals, where we all know debates are won or lost. I don't make a special effort to keep up with those who skip around between five flows.

Judging Philosophy Statement
1987 CEDA National Tournament

Jackson,
Mississippi
39210

(601) 354-52C

Millsaps College

Name: Lee H. Reiff

School: Millsaps College

Rounds Judged on This Topic: 5

This is much more a statement of who I am, of my amateur status, and of my sense of what debate ought to be than of CEDA judging philosophy.

I am an old debater from the late 40s, whose academic field is religion, who helped a bit with the forensics program at Millsaps (and did a fair amount of judging) in the late 60s. That program died when the forensics coach left, and for more than 15 years there has been no intercollegiate forensics activity here. Now, because of active student interest, and pending hoped-for budgeting for a coach, I am advising and guiding students as best I can. This tournament is only the second we have attended (we started late this year). I am working at getting acclimated to the cross-examination form and to non-policy debate questions (both of which I like in principle).

I am frankly still more than a little mystified by the jargon of CEDA debate, including the issues raised on the suggested format for this philosophy statement. For the most part I will not attempt to address those issues, unless by implication.

I see debate as a special, ritualized, "gamed" form of public discourse, discourse whose purpose (and whose educational value) lies in the examination of real issues and the attempt to persuade an audience. Debates which revolve around the special jargon of debate theory and make heavy use of shorthand (e.g., "V.O.") seem to me to escape this purpose. Too rapid delivery likewise voids this purpose. In my mind a good debate is one that can be judged, and judged well, by an intelligent layperson. Judging ought not to require command of a special jargon, nor training in listening to a verbal shorthand delivered at twice the pace of normal intelligible public speech.

None of this means that I will shut my ears to debates using this jargon. I will struggle with it. But I am not expert: neither as a student debater nor at any other time have I studied debate theory -- I simply did it as a student, and did it well. Beyond that, I am an intelligent academic who knows something about effective public speaking and persuasion, who thinks those arts are important, who can weigh evidence and trains of reasoning. It is on a paradigm of debate as public discourse, accessible to any reasonably intelligent and judicisious person, that I want to judge.

Rockhurst College

Kansas City's Jesuit College

Department of Communication

JANE RHINEHART
ROCKHURST COLLEGE
JUDGING PHILOSOPHY

I have enjoyed judging on this topic as it has provided an interesting semester of debate. I agree that due to the "negative" wording of the topic that some burdens of proof have shifted to the negative. And yet philosophically I insist upon a logically consistent approach to case. Hence, affirmative teams may only establish criteria by which I may analyze negative burdens. On the other hand, such a criteria must establish a clear threshold by which the affirmative can be analyzed in light of such criteria. In other words, I want a criteria by which both affirmative and negative burdens can be simultaneously evaluated.

Cases must be clear and compelling. Negative teams win rounds on presumption alone if affirmative teams fail to demonstrate their prima facie burdens. These burdens cannot be shifted. Affirmative teams must "extend as well as defend if they hope to win". Negative teams must clash with case, and I hold second negative to the same burden as I do first negative. Off-case should not be an adventure where no man has gone before. I expect to be able to compare off-case to case so that I can weight them. I cannot compare apples to oranges.

Crystalize in rebuttals. Tell me specifically where I should look in order to vote. Never leave a judge to figure it all out after the round. Take heed affirmative, this is a must. Negative teams may intentionally try and confuse the issues as a tactic. I'll punish them on points, its up to you to clarify in order to win.

Finally, in terms of speed. I can probably write as fast as you can read. But I can't comprehend as fast as I can write. I don't believe that CEDA was intended to be a "block party". My decisions do not go against the weight of evidence, but I want quality and comprehension, not quantity and apprehension.

March 20, 1987

Roberta Richards
Marshall University
years judging: college, 1
rounds judged on this topic: 2 tournaments

There is nothing obscure or alarming about my 'judging philosophy.' I will admit a preference for substatative arguments over formidable-sounding semantic squibbles. Beyond that, I try to be flexible and respond to the situation at hand. I am reluctant to commit myself to one stand on judging paradigms, counter warrants, prima facia requirements etc.

I judge solely on the basis of what has been said in the round; I will not drop an argument because I know it to be false nor make connections which were not presented in the round. I am open to unusual interpretations, but they must be thoroughly justified and defended. Evidence, in my opinion, plays a central but not primary role; evidence cards with no analysis behind them have little impact.

I am not adverse to being amused.

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

Larry S. Richardson, Western Washington University

Years Judging: 30 Rounds Judged on Topic: 60

PARADIGM: I am more a critic of argument than anything else. For a long time, I was a hypothesis tester but I got over that even though I find it very applicable to CEDA debate. Maybe I am a small h hypo tester. I also subscribe to such traditions of a forensic (legal) model as burden of proof, burden of rebuttal, presumption, etc. When I invent my own paradigm, it will include due consideration of quality of argument, adaptation to opponent, courtesy, and delivery useful to non-debate speaking.

AFFIRMATIVE: A prima facie case in CEDA should provide good reasons to believe the resolution, definitions of terms, and clear statements of values which justify belief. While I am willing to listen to topicality arguments from both sides, I am biased against exploitative use of the language of definition. The affirmative must be reasonably topical, but I believe that more than one reasonable definition may exist. The negative would have to demonstrate a definition unreasonable in order for me to vote on topicality alone. But, a weak affirmative topicality defense may weigh against them in the overall calculus of the decison.

NEGATIVE: Counter values are good reasons to reject the resolution, as separate from the affirmative case, and I will consider them. Many of the blocs I have heard this year described as counter warrants are actually just refutations of the affirmative case or are, perhaps, value objections. I consider a counter warrant to be much more a complete case against the resolution.

Presumption is with the negative but I will listen to presumption shift arguments. Remember that the debate is over the resolution.

I react to counter-intuitive arguments with much scepticism. I am reminded of Bishop Whately's observation that presumption lies against the paradoxicalin most listeners' minds. Thus, I expect careful argument to explain paradox.

I think conditional arguments <u>are</u> a good way to deal with justification arguments. They <u>are not</u> appropriate when used as tactics for getting opponents to waste time.

EVIDENCE: As a critic of argument, I expect to weight evidence in terms of the qualitative criteria found in Freeley or any other good argumentation text. I try to listen carefully to find if evidence proves what the advocate claims. Misapplication is an issue. I believe citations should include author, source, and date. I penalize for sloppy citation. I automatically give a loss when convinced of a serious violation of evidentiary ethics.

STYLE AND DELIVERY: This is still an oral activity and I give a lot of weight to oral performance. While I am not sure that all rounds need to be suitable for the Rotary Club, I believe that my dean would enjoy the encounter were I to bring him along to the tournament. Cross examination should be conversational. I heavily penalize students who are abusive in cross examination periods. My pet peeve is the stare-straight-ahead-zombie approach in a situation that should be interpersonal in its comunication style.

IN GENERAL: I believe that all behavior in a round should be conducive to the future vitality and development of debate as an educational activity.

CEDA JUDGING PHILOSOPHY
Dave Riek
Northern Arizona University
3 years coaching

I am one of those coaches that spends a great deal of time working with both CEDA and NDT debate teams. For me, there is no significant difference between the two. Debate is debate, and the better debate team wins my ballot. If teams feel the need to present a large number of arguments, and can present them clearly, I will not punish them for it. If, however, their opponents can present adequate, if less numerous responses, they can beat a faster team.

On this semester's topic, I have a habit of voting for teams that make absolute positions, e.g. privacy is bad, or only 'regulations' are topical. This approach affords the clearest clash on the topic, and for this critic clash is the most important aspect of debate.

I also appreciate theory arguments, which is unfortunate on this topic. I usually look for fairness when evaluating theory positions. (If an interpretation of the resolution is fair to both sides then why not allow it?)

I abhor rudeness in debate rounds. If competitors can't temper their aggressiveness with civility then they risk losing credibility with this critic.

Judging Philosophy Statement

Name: James E. Roper (Philosophy Dept)
School: Michigan State University
Years Judging: 3 Rounds on Topic: 22

1. Paradigm: The role of a CEDA judge is to determine which team gives the "best reasons" all things considered to accept the value judgment they are defending. Most theoretical arguments (in the sense of debate theory) play a minimal role in evaluating CEDA.
2. Affirmative: Affirmative must defend the resolution. Topicality is judged using the same "best reasons" standard mentioned above.
3. Negative: I don't find counter warrant theory helpful in CEDA debate. Conditional and counter-intuitive arguments are o.k. if they are well-argued. A "growth" argument, e.g., will require great attention to causal links. Most teams are not prepared to meet my standards for such arguments. Presumption is based on the "best reasons" standard.
4. Evidence: I base my judgment of who wins the round on well developed arguments that show careful analysis and relevant evidential support. I am not a "blank tablet" judge. "Evidence" which is clearly silly or counter intuitive in its conclusions must include the reasons for those conclusions in order to be weighed in the round. Evidence from debate theory requires reasons which link it to the sort of "best reasons" standard I use.
5. Cross-Examination: I weigh Cross-Ex. in the round. Style and Delivery: Please use complete words. The debate should be understandable by an intelligent layperson, so avoid technical debate terms as much as possible. In general, speed in delivery is incompatible with well developed arguments as judged on the "best reasons" standard. Please speak to and not around the other teams arguments.
6. I teach business ethics (including this topic), social philosophy, philosophy of science, and critical thinking (logic) at MSU.

Edward Schiappa
Kansas State University
10 years judging, 80 rounds this year

Below I have tried to answer the questions I suspect most frequently come to mind when faced with a judge you do not know:

1) Can I go fast? Yes. As long as you are clear and organized, speed does not bother me. Most of my years of debate as participant and coach have been in NDT. What I like about CEDA is the avoidance of (most) counter-intuitive arguments. I do NOT see CEDA as being different from NDT because one is a public speaking activity and the other, not.

2) What about Theory? I am pretty much a theoretical anarchist. That is, I come into the round with few commitments as to theory other than the order and length of speeches and the need to be fair. In CEDA theory is still evolving at a rapid rate. Articles in early CEDA yearbooks are not as dynamic now as they were then.

I believe theory should fit the current topic. For example, the current topic does not appear to me to be a typical value topic. One could argue it as a claim of fact, a claim of "meaning," a "trait inference," or something new.

I am rarely persuaded by theory "evidence" unless you are able to explain the rationale behind the card (in which case you probably didn't need to read it). I don't buy "this is CEDA so you must do such and such" even if someone once said it in print.

3) What about evidence cites? I normally expect no more than a last name and year. However, on this topic more detail is useful. For example, when a card discusses the constitutionality of drug testing, I want to know if you are quoting Ed Meese, a 3rd year law student, a business hack or a Federal District Court Judge's opinion. If you have confidence in your evidence you would do well to let me know why it is more credible than your opponent's.

4) Decision Criteria: There are at least two issues you should be clear on: first, what are your burdens? Are you attacking ALL testing, just random testing, just government employees, or what? Identify your position at the outset. Second, who am I? Am I to decide the constitutionality of testing (a legal approach) or their social appropriateness (in which case court decisions are less important). You should set forth these positions.

5) Topicality: Often abused by Affs in NDT, I find that in CEDA Negs are doing the abusing. As long as the Aff doesn't play games with the words "controlled substances," I am unlikely to vote against them on T unless the Negative does a very compelling job of identifying an interpretation that they can convince me is grossly unfair or otherwise harmful.

The University of Oklahoma

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION
Forensics/Debate
780 Van Vleet Oval, Room 331
Norman, Oklahoma 73019
(405) 325-1596 or 325-3111

David E. Scott
University of Oklahoma

Judging Philosophy

Paradigm
The role of the judge is to be the objective arbitrator of the debate. In terms of the judge being the referee (Ulrich 1985) non-verbal communication will be given during a round to indicate appropriate speed or other preferences. I plan to employ the policymaking paradigm (Freely 1981) overlaid with good public speaking (Patterson and Zarefsky 1983). I approach judging from a 'real world' perspective. Abstract theory arguments has little value for me. The implications of this perspective is that 'practical' harms/solvency/impacts should be discussed. Thus arguments like authoritarism may not carry much weight. In the absence of a theoritical decision rule arguments will be weighed 'on balance'. Theory arguments should have direct links to the resolution.

Affirmative
Generally speaking (this topic is somewhat of a exception) the affirmative has the burden to present and defend a prima facie case. The standard elements of a good prima facie case would include the stock elements of harm, significance, inherency and advantages (Cirlin 1985). For this topic affirmative will need to show at least significance and harms. Topicality arguments will need to be refuted by the affirmative to win the debate.

Negative
In CEDA debate counter-warrants provide a method for topical analysis (Tolbert and Rost 1985). Counter-warrants are justified if the affirmative uses atypical or insignificant examples. However, negative needs to be careful; if the counter-warrants only serve to decrease clash or promote superficial analysis it can seriously hurt the negative cause. Presumption for this topic lies with the affirmative, thus negatives needs to establish an effective warrant to overcome this presumption. Intuitive arguments are okay if reasonable, ditto for conditional arguments.

Evidence
Evidence can definitely add to the strength of an argument. Evidence is obviously a good idea otherwise the debate will degenerate to assertions and counter-assertions. Points can be argued from 'common knowledge', however it is a calculated risk to assume that this judge will be informed on the relevant point. Complete cites are definitely not required in the round (author,publication,date is fine). If necessary I will read evidence after a round, especially if it crucial to my decision. When evidence conflicts, source authority, recency, representativeness will be considered. Evidence on debate theory rarely carries weight with me with one important exception, it can be used to attack 'squirrel cases'.

Style and Delivery
The role of cross-examination is to clarify points and establish future arguments, it can also be used as a tactical device to allow more prep time for your partner. Delivery affects my judging to a great extent. It is interesting to note that four out of the last five NDT championships have been won by the team with the best delivery not the greatest number of arguments on the flow. I believe this is a healthy trend. Further, if speed renders the argument incomprehensible it does not get flowed. In terms of style, decorum should always prevail; athenism is a big no no.

Other
I do not like excessively fast rounds. Debate should be a fun activity so lets not try to get too serious during rounds. In terms of this particular topic the invasion of privacy is implicit so the negative needs to establish an effective warrant to justify the invasion. Affirmative does not have establish solvency, so alternatives to drug testing are not that important and could be dangerous.

CAL POLY

Name: B. Christine Shea

School: Cal Poly, SLO

Years judging: 4 Rounds judged on this topic: 30

Paradigm: My paradigm is based on the "reasonable person" standard. Being a reasonable person, I accept only those arguments which appeal to a person's sense of rationality. For instance, most reasonable individuals would not believe that drug testing regulations cause species extinction, world hunger, or nuclear war. Overall, I am persuaded by sound arguments; clear, relevant, source-qualified evidence; and strong analysis.

Affirmative: Affirmative teams should present a case that sufficiently supports the resolution. Their burden is to provide reasonable definitions, establish criteria and/or decision-rules, and offer substantive contentions. Topicality is a stock issue, and I accept reasonable interpretations of the resolution. "Reasonableness"may be debated by both teams.

Negative: I prefer direct clash with Affirmative case contentions, definitions, and criteria. I reward teams which isolate and analyze the flaws evident in their opponents' arguments while advancing their own position. Although there are few true "value objections" on this resolution, sensible counterwarrants are appropriate and acceptable.

Evidence: Every debater should effectively use evidence in conjunction with sound reasoning and analysis. I am not persuaded by cards without sufficient application; nor am I persuaded by evidence that lacks adequate source qualifications. "Smith in '86" is a no more acceptable means of support than a mere assertion offered by a debater in a particular round. Being an attentive as well as intentive listener, I accept what the evidence actually says not what the debater claims it says. Ideally, claims made by the debater and the evidence are the same.

Style & Delivery: I am not overly impressed by eloquent delivery nor do I appreciate rapid-fire delivery. If the arguments are presented in an incomprehensible manner, they're unacceptable.

Years judging: 3 Rounds judged on this topic: alot

1. Paradigm

I'm not inconsistent; I'm tabula rasa.

2. Affirmative

I do not impose any prima facia requirements on the affirmative. Those, as well as any other requirement, must be justified by the debaters.

I am told that I am very liberal regarding topicality. Indeed, I enjoy hearing creative interpretations of the resolution. I also enjoy hearing what most folks call "squirrel" T arguments. Such arguments force debaters to think rather than present the same arguments prepared during the first week of the semester.

When I resolve topicality, I use standards justified by the debaters in each particular round. Absent a standard, I will have a difficult time resolving the argument and will probably ignore it.

3. Negative

The legitimacy or illegitimacy of counter warrants must be decided by the debaters. Absent any argumentation to the contrary, I personally feel that counter warrants are acceptable arguments.

I do not usually assign presumption to either side; it must be argued and won in the round.

The legitimacy or illegitimacy of counter-intuitive arguments must be decided by the debaters. Absent any argumentation to the contrary, counter-intuitive arguments are acceptable. I don't think that "growth is bad" is necessarily a counter-intuitive argument.

The legitimacy or illegitimacy of conditional arguments must be decided by the debaters. Absent any argumentation to the contrary, I personally feel that conditional arguments are acceptable.

4. Evidence

Evidence is secondary only to the development, application, and extension of the arguments themselves.

Debaters need not read complete cites. However, they should be available (on the cards, preferably) in rounds.

I sometimes read evidence after rounds when I am not sure if the content matches the claim it is supposed to support. I usually read evidence after rounds when its validity has been questioned.

I weigh conflicting evidence by comparing the content of the cards. I weigh source qualifications only when they have been argued to be important.

I prefer that evidence on debate theory include or be accompanied by some sort of analysis to support the claim(s).

5. Style and Delivery

Cross-examination should be utilized to clarify opponents' arguments and to gather information for later speeches.

Delivery, in and of itself, does not influence my decision. I prefer very organized debates. By organized, I mean that each and every argument should be accurately and consistently signposted throughout the debate. It is usually much easier for me to locate

"Contention II.B.3" than "the stuff on safety." I base speaker points almost exclusively on how "clean" my flow is at the end of the debate.

6. Other

Debaters who take evidence out of context will likely recieve a loss and/or zero speaker points. I am very sympathetic to debaters who are the subject of flippant claims from the opposition that evidence has been taken out of context. I dislike that tactic. Do not make such an accusation unless you intend to prove it and can prove it in the round. Debaters who seriously charge that the opposition has taken evidence out of context but fail to prove that claim may receive a loss and/or zero speaker points.

I do not view debate as a "real world" activity; rather, as an artificial setting to test critical and strategic thinking, as well as communication skills. Thus, I have no problem with voting on weirdness such as cracked earth, nuke war good, liberty bad, etc.

I don't feel that my role as critic requires me to sort through a very muddled round. Thus, I often look for the easy way out; that is, something more or less clear in the round on which I can base a decision.

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY 1987 CEDA NATIONALS

NAME: Jim Springston

SCHOOL: Marist College

YEARS JUDGING: 16 ROUNDS JUDGED ON THIS TOPIC: 50

1. PARADIGM

I always allow all rules in a debate except time limits and the resolution to be set in the round through argumentation by the debaters in the round. Theoretical arguments should be argued before the content of the argument. If these theoretical arguments are not responded to,they become the basis of my decision. Unless it has been argued in the round,presumption always lies with the negative.

2. AFFIRMATIVE

I tend to be conservative on topicality. Especially on this semester's topic. I like the best def. standard.

3. NEGATIVE

I come into a round strongly believing that presumption lies with the neg. BUT I am open to presumption shift argumentation. The neg. must then explain WHY a presumption shift is not legitimate. I like counter warrants only when the neg. is caught by surprise. I am very opposed to counter-intuitive args like growth,species,and 34 nuke wars. They don't belong in CEDA.

4. EVIDENCE

I like to hear complete cites. I normally do not read ev. after the round. I want the debaters through their persuasive and analytical skills to tell me why I should accept one over the other.

5. STYLE AND DELIVERY

CX is important and I listen carefully. I value delivery very highly it is one of the 5 canons of rhetoric and should be given equal consideration to the other four.

6. MISC.

I dislike speed without analysis or without clarity. I would rather hear 5 or 6 well developed and analyzed arguments than 30 or 40 labels tossed out without analysis. I dislike theoretical arguments when the debater does not understand the thesis behind the brief. I like humor that is appropriate and not overdone.

Judging Philosophy Statement
1987 CEDA National Tournament

NAME: Pamela Stepp

SCHOOL: Cornell University

Years Judging: 15 Rounds Judged on this topic: 20

1. Paradigm. A debate judge should use their knowledge of debate to judge the round. The decision should be based on the actual debate being heard. Although I try to be Tabula Rasa I don't think any judge really is. Most of my decisions are based on the issues in the round sometimes on skills. Especially in a very close debate persuasion helps a lot. I will dock speaker points for rudeness.

2. Affirmative. First affirmatives must establish a standard or criterion to be used as a decision rule. Second they must show whether the object of evaluation satisfies the standard. Topicality is a voting issue. I will use best definition standard.

3. Negative. I will not vote against counter warrants. I prefer not to hear them. In Ceda debate presumption is not affixed to one side. It can be argued in the round. I will give presumption to the team who proves popular opinion is behind the value or to the team who does the best job of debating. I've heard some very poor growth arguments this semester because most of them come from back files and have little to do with the economics of 1987. I like negatives to show some application of their V.O.s to the particular round.

4. Evidence. There should be an equal amount of emphasis on analysis, evidence and delivery in a round. Evidence is to be used to support arguments and not as a conclusion of an argument. It is not a good practice for a judge to ask for evidence after a round. I will ask to see cards if it was a very close round or if a team accuses someone of misuse. If evidence conflicts I'll look at date and source. Evidence on debate theory is acceptable.

5. Style and Delivery. Information from cross examination does not count until it is used in the constructives. Delivery influences my judging a lot. Yet decisions are not based on delivery alone. I want a balance of analysis, evidence and delivery. It is a Ceda debaters obligation to handle all three well. I may drop my pen if I cannot understand a debater.

6. Likes and dislikes. I expect debaters to have a sense of reality and to use common sense if they expect judges to use common sense in their judging decisions.

NDT 1984

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY

NAME Glen Strickland INSTITUTION Northeast Oklahoma

POSITION Director of Forensics YEARS OF COACHING 14

NUMBER OF TOURNAMENTS JUDGED AT THIS YEAR 7

1. DECISION MAKING PARADIGM: I prefer the policy making paradigm embodied the concept of systems analysis. This does not mean that I am unwilling to listen to defenses of other paradigms. However, the purest form of excellence in debate is found in the comparison of two competing policies.

2. TOPICALITY: (a) The central purpose of the resolution is to provide boundaries within which debaters may develop arguments. While latitude is needed to allow reasonable interpretations of the resolution, the affirmative must be prepared to establish and defend criteria for reasonability. (b) Parameters provide the most reasonable interpretation of framers' intent. (c) Negatives advancing topicality arguments should be prepared to defend criteria for determining what is and is not reasonable. (d) Key Terms in the 1983/84 Resolution: (1) Any And All Injuries: I believe that the affirmative plan must hold the producer legally responsible for all injuries occurring after implementation of the plan. The affirmative is not required to deal with past injuries. (2) Waste is a byproduct of the manufacturing process. (3) Legal Responsibility is best defined as "an obligation to act." (4) The affirmative has the option of dealing with one, several, or all hazardous wastes. I do not believe the resolution was intended to require affirmatives to deal with all hazardous wastes. I seriously doubt that any of the framers of this resolution even know what a collective or generic noun is.

3. COUNTERPLANS: (a) Mutual exclusivity is the most reasonable standard by which to measure competitiveness. (b) Counterplans must be judged non-topical by the same criteria by which affirmative plans are judged topical. (c) Topical counterplans independently justify adoption of the resolution. (d) Exemption counterplans are acceptable so long as the exemptions are specific to topical affirmative plan provisions. (e) Study counterplans are strongest when evidence is specific to affirmative interpretations. (f) Counterplans should be competitive to the resolution being debated. For example, referendum counterplans only provide means by which to implement a "should" resolution and are, therefore, not competitive to the specific resolution. (g) Counterwarrants on this year's resolution assume that the affirmative must deal with all hazardous waste. Personally, I do not believe that counterwarrants theory is worth the amount of ink and paper which have been devoted to it. The affirmative plan, if topical, is the resolution, and the negative has the burden to clash with that interpretation.

4. ADD-ONS, TURNAROUNDS: Add-ons and turnarounds provide additional reason to adopt the resolution. Both must meet plan vacs and evidentiary requirements. Labeling an argument as a turn does not make it so.

5. STYLE: (a) I will vote on the basis of what I am able to flow. Speed is not a reason for ballot. (b) It is assumed that answers given in cross-examination are binding. (c) Each debater is responsible for the legitimacy and accuracy of his/her evidence. (d) I feel that each debater has the responsibility to state the impact of his/her arguments

DON R. SWANSON

WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY

Judge for 23 years, approximately 20 rounds this topic.

Paradigm: I attempt to judge each debate on its unique merits, and apply a tabula rasa philosophy. Debaters should clearly develop the criteria that they wish me to apply in evaluating their analysis of the proposition. I like thoughtful well developed theory arguments. I dislike poorly developed theory arguments. Any argument a debater wishes to advocate, I will consider, however I have a difficult time accepting counterintuitive arguments.

Affirmative: The prima facia standard I apply is a reasonable man standard coupled with the usual rhetorical requirements of clarity, coherence, and logical sufficiency. I am generally conservative on topicality and prefer the best definintion standard to the most reasonable standard.

Negative: The negative must establish a clear clash with the affirmative case as presented. I often react in a negative fashion to counterwarrants. Presumption usually rests with the negative and the level of significance necessary to overcome presumption depends upon the criteria established in the round. When the negative attacks affirmative criteria, I expect to hear well developed countercriteria.

Evidence: Evidence is very important, however it must be properly used. I dislike debaters overclaiming evidence. I expect the debater to explain how the evidence supports the argument. I do not require complete cites, but I am bothered by cites which give me too little information to weigh the import of the evidence. Quality is more important than quanity. I don't often read evidence after a round. I will usually read evidence only if I feel that it is my listening fault for not understanding its impact, or if it is absolutely necessary to resolve an evidence dispute.

Style & Delivery: The conduct of cross examination is very significant psychologically and for its impact in clarifying issues. I expect persuasive delivery that would impress an audience of careful, critical, interested listeners who are not debate coaches. I do not enjoy listening to an excessive spread.

FRANK M. THOMPSON, JR.
Director of Forensics
Individual Events

DAVID J. THOMPSON
Associate Director of Forensics
Debate

ANNABEL DUNHAM HAGOOD
Chairperson, Department of Speech Communication
Lecturer

P.O. Box 1965
Tuscaloosa
Alabama 35487-1965

Tel: (205) 348-5990

Alabama Forensics Council

The University of Alabama

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY
DR. DAVID J. THOMPSON

1. Paradigm. I feel the role of the judge in CEDA is to evaluate the argumentation of the debaters and based primarily on that argumentation, come to a decision as to the winner. I feel that I am a fairly "liberal" judge and would vote on any issue in a round as long as it was significant, impacted and understandable.

2. Affirmative. In terms of prima facie requirements on the affirmative I would certainly think that affirmatives need to be topical and significant. I feel that I am fairly liberal when it comes to topicality, but would certainly vote on it as in issue in a round. In terms of standards for topicality, I allow the debaters to argue that issue. Best definition versus reasonable definition in my opinion is a argumentative issue.

3. Negative. I generally assume that negatives hold presumption in rounds. (I can be persuaded otherwise, but this would be my general feeling). I coached high school debate for six years so "growth is bad", and all those other generic V.O.'s (bad name for D.A.) are fine.

4. Evidence. I generally read evidence after rounds, particularly in rounds that are close. Evidence on debate theory is fine, but application of the theory to the round is imperative.

5. Style and Delivery. If I have a particular mandate for debaters in the rounds I am judging it would certainly be in the area of organization. This business of saying "Go to where they say" often means little to me, particularly when "they" say it in five or six different places. Speed does not disturb me as long as I know where the debater is.

Years Judging: 10 Rounds Judged on this topic: 100's

1987 CEDA JUDGING PHILOSOPHY
Walter Ulrich, Vanderbilt University
14 years of Judging; about 20 rounds on the topic

Paradigm: I view myself as a tabula rasa judge, with all issues being open to debate. Thus, the views expressed in this philosophy could change in a given round if a team advances arguments for why the debate should be evaluated in a different manner. In absence of theoretical arguments to the contrary, I tend to adopt a utilitarian standard for weighing values: I support the value that will produce the greatest amount of pleasure for the greatest number of people.

Affirmative: I tend to employ the better definition standard. Since we are discussing values, I would employ the most rigorous test for determining the meaning of the resolution. After all, a philosopher would not be satisfied by a "reasonable" definition of justice, fairness, etc.; he or she would seek the best definition of these terms. In addition, I view topicality in CEDA as operating like extratopicality in policy debate; it is not always a voting issue, it merely determines which issues are relevant to the decision. While in many rounds it may be a voting issue, in some cases it merely makes some case arguments irrelevant, while other affirmative arguments would still justify supporting the resolution as defined by the negative team.

Negative: Unlike policy debate, I think many value debates are normally best evaluated by looking at the entirety of the resolution and asking whether or not, on balance, the resolution is probably true. How relevant counterwarrants are to a given debate, however, depends on the wording of the topic (and, obviously, on the arguments advanced in the debate). Counter-intuitive arguments are fine, but my should be well developed.

Evidence: The quality of the arguments and/or evidence needed for a position depends on the importance of that position. I am unlikely to vote for a position that is not well developed if that requires that I ignore other, more developed positions. In weighing positions I look, not only at who won the argument, but the degree of confidence I have in that position. That determination is based upon the strength of the support for that position. This strength is based on two factors: the credibility of the source, as presented in the round; and the reasoning included in the evidence. Conclusionary evidence is given very little weight. Evidence about what values people do share (or how courts have ruled on privacy) does not help explain what values we should support. I am also unlikely to look at more than two or three evidence cards per tournament.

Style and Delivery: I view cross examination as binding. I would much rather have teams admit they are unsure about the context of evidence than to make false claims about its context. Debaters should feel free to make choices in rebuttals and to emphasize the issues they feel are critical instead of attempting to cover every issue in the round.

Other: I will vote against any team reading manufactured or greatly distorted evidence. False accusations may also result in a loss by the team making the accusation. If the false accusation was reasonable, but turned out to be unwarranted, neither side will be penalized. I determine whether evidence is distorted by asking whether the author cited would agree with the statement that is attributed to that author.

Finally, I do think that debate should be fun, and dislike rude and arogant debaters.

Judging Philosophy Statement
1987 CEDA National Tournament

NAME: Willis M. Watt
SCHOOL: Fort Hays State University, Hays, KS
YEARS JUDGING: 3 (for CEDA)
ROUNDS JUDGED ON THIS TOPIC: 20

1. PARADIGM: The role of the judge in a debate round is to decide which team did the better job of argumentation during the round within the context of that specific debate. I am affected in some ways by all the conventional paradigms, however, I feel that I am what I refer to as a "reasoned decision maker." That is to say that I listen to and then weigh the information that the teams have presented. I evaluate the logic of the teams' arguments along with the evidence presented to me. I do not vote on the amount of evidence presented, but I consider it in the context of the round. This means that a team had better be sure that their tags, evidence, and impacts are clearly linked. I am convinced that in CEDA, as opposed to NDT, it is vitally important for the teams to provide the theoretical basis upon which I should evaluate their arguments and make my final decision. When I am left to make the decision in the absence of a theory base I tend to rely on the logic of the arguments and how well they have been supported by credible evidence.

2. AFFIRMATIVE: The AFF has the burden to present a case in 1AC that is relevant to the topic and is thoroughly acceptable so that if I should not hear any other speech I would be obliged to vote affirmative. The AFF must present a justified case for me to accept the resolution. I believe that in CEDA debate TOPICALITY is a voter! I tend to be ultraconservative on this matter. Whether a definition has to be reasonable or the best is a matter for the round. If a team argues poorly that if should be the "best" while the other team effectively says that it only needs to be merely "reasonalbe" then I will side with the "reasonalbe" team or vice versa. The issue is decided in the round by the skill of the teams and their knowledge. I try not to apply pre-round biases within a specific round. I want the teams to do the debating, not me!

3. NEGATIVE: Counter warrants, counter-intuitive arguments, conditional arguments are all areas that I leave to the NEG team. I do not have a pre-round bias opposing them. If a team should want to use any of these I would advise them to do a complete and understandable job of why they are acceptable and how they fit into this particular round. I do think that such tactics may present unfair advantage to the NEG by limiting the ground of the AFF. PRESUMPTION is a burden against the AFF team, but the NEG should not rely on crying "wolf." When they get in trouble handling the AFF case it is not enough for them to say "Well, we have presumption. We don't have to prove it." This reasoning goes over like a lead ballon. The NEG has just as much of a responsibility to defend and prove their arguments as the AFF does in a debate round. To say that "X" amount of significance will overcome the presumption burden is silly. This issue can only be determined within the context of a particular debate round.

4. EVIDENCE: I use evidence to support/prove the assertions made by either team. It is often the function of evidence to convice me that a particular position is more viable than another. There are those situations wherein I will decide a round after comparing evidence on the KEY issue(s) of that particular round. I do not find it necessary to read the entire citation (unless the other team or I call for it). Conflicting evidence is weighed upon the date, source, context of the statement(s), and how it was used in the round. TO ALL DEBATERS: by all means feel free to use evidence on debate theory.

5. STYLE AND DELIVERY: Cross-X is a fact finding time and information gathering process. It is not a time to play "Perry Mason." Nor is it a time to be snotty and rude. The information gathered should be used in planning what you will argue in the round. INFORMATION BROUGHT UP IN CROSS-X IS NOT USED IN VOTING UNLESS THE TEAM BRINGS IT UP IN ONE OF THEIR SPEECHES. I prefer listening to a polite, straightforward round of arguments at a speed conducive to communication. HOWEVER, I DO NOT VOTE ON SPEED OR ANY OTHER DELIVERY FACTOR (your speaker points might be affected, however). If I can understand you and get it on the flow, I'll vote on the issues. I like a debate with CLASH!

WATT, WILLIS M.
Fort Hays State University
Judging Philosophy Statement

6. OTHER: LIKE--politeness.
LIKE--when time is called---stop.
LIKE--direct clash.
LIKE--space---don't stand on top of me in a room (especially if you will be shouting).
LIKE--to be relaxed and have fun (the other team are the devil's children).
LIKE--humor (but it doesn't take the place of sound arguments).
LIKE--teams that don't abuse the preparation time rule.
LIKE--to think that this an academic game with rules (like football)---so play the game!

NOTE: I AM HIGHLY INFLUENCED BY THE INDIVIDUAL ROUND AND WHAT OCCURS WITHIN THAT ROUND. I AM FLEXIBLE AND WEIGH THE INFORMATION BASED ON WHAT I PERCEIVE (FLOW) AS OCCURRING DURING THE DEBATE...BE AWARE SINCE I MAY CHANGE DURING THE ROUND IF THE TEAM SO CONVINCES ME...WATCH THE JUDGE AND ADAPT DURING THE ROUND.

Southwest Missouri State
UNIVERSITY

SMSU Forensics
Department of Communication
(417) 836-4788

JUDGING PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT--TERRY WEST, SOUTHWEST MO. STATE

1. PARADIGM: I see myself as an evaluator of the argument and debate skills presented in a particular round. While not tabula rasa, I attempt to be objective and have voted for positions I personally despised. However, debaters should realize there is a natural presumption in my mind against certain arguments (meatballs with bad links, for instance). I expect clear, structured, properly evidenced argument with analysis. Theoretical arguments are permissable; I try to let the teams decide who "wins" them. "Evidence" from other debate coaches may serve to clarify theory, but is not necessar authoritative. I expect affirmatives to set criteria, and negatives to argue against it if they disagree. I will use these criterion-based arguments to evaluate the roun

2. AFFIRMATIVE: To me, prima facia simply means the affirmative case must be adequate in 1AC before negative refutation. If negative can make a clear argument that aff. has missed the boat, and win it, I will vote on it. This is rare. I will vote on topicality if neg. wins it, but I hate frivolous T. arguments. T. may also only be an extra-topicality issue in some situations--it usually only takes out part of the aff. impact then. T. standards should be argued in the round, and violations made clear. 2AC should extend 1AC; "dumps" should be linked clearly. 2AR must resemble the responses made in 1AN. I expect 1AC to be a speech, with analysis--not tags and cards.

3. NEGATIVE: Counterwarrants are voting issues if neg. wins that aff. is a hasty generalization. Personally, I think the topic is a boundary, not a generalization, but neg. could win the argument. Game rule presumption is always neg.; there are various degr of presumption society assigns to values and policies. Aff. must give me a significa reason to believe I should accept their interpretation of the topic--I cannot give an absolute sig. standard. As noted above, counter-intuitive arguments carry a heavier presumption against them. I hate meatballs which are merely substitutes for laziness in research. Link them, win them, and if they outweigh case I will likely vote for t Conditional arguments are meaningless until one is finally picked; I give great latitude to teams answering sudden shifts, and will not allow shifts to be voters. Evidentiary contradictions cannot be dropped; the ev. remains in the round.

4. EVIDENCE: Evidence is a key component of argument, along with logical analysis. Comple cites seem unreasonable; but I need some source qualification other than Smith in '84. I read ev. after rounds when I missed something on the flow or if teams are quibbling about a particular card. Conflicting ev. is weighed according to semantic force, sou qualifications, empiricism, and correctness of advocate's claim (as in not overclaimed not necessarily in that order. See "paradigm" above for reaction to theory evidence.

5. STYLE/DELIVERY: Delivery should be clear. Speed is not as much an issue as is clarity and analysis. I will not flow incomprehensible argument. Cross-exam should be used to clarify, set up future positions, emphasize positions/evidence, or note flaws in opponents' case. I HATE RUDENESS! It is just not necessary in c-x or speeches.

6. MISCELLANEOUS: Pet peeves--giving partner oral direction (i.e., "go to the underview!") while it is partner's turn to speak, not yours. Oral time signals are o.k., but do your own speech. Flippant, unproven ethics challenges will lose you the round and my respect. Present yourselves like humans--not bums, and not "dandies." The only thing about this topic debaters should know for me is that I believe it asks us to evaluate both tests for controlled substances and invasions of privacy. I do not believe it "assumes" invasion. Feel free to ask for more info. before a round, as long as you have specific questions, not just "what's your philosophy?"

901 South National Avenue
Springfield, Missouri 65804

THE UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION
BOX 3041, UNIVERSITY STATION
LARAMIE, WYOMING 82071

Mark Whitney Assistant Forensics Coach Two years coaching

Judged at ten tournaments this year

GENERAL PARADIGM: I'm pretty much open to whatever the teams want to present. I really emphasize the word REASONABLE. But, if the affirmative presents something that I don't feel is reasonable, and the negative lets them get away with it, that's just tough for the negative I guess. If a negative is going to present a counter criterion (and I certainly encourage them to), they better show me why I shouldn't accept the affirmative's. A trend I see on this topic, which I really don't like, is that a lot of affirmative's are saying, "Well, we need to show X, but the negative needs to show X1, Y, and Z." I strongly feel that the negative should be able to (and have to) chose how they want to attack an affirmative case. I HATE it when the affirmative dictates the negative ground.

AFFIRMATIVE BURDENS: Of course the affirmative needs to be Prima Facia, and I will vote on Prima Facia attacks. Other then that, I see this topic as having its emphasis on the word "regulations," not on the phrase "testing for controlled substances." I really don't care if there's anything in the case concerning tests or not, as long as there's something concerning whether or not regulations calling for tests are an unjustified invasion.

COUNTERWARRANTS/PLANS: I'm really pretty fond of counterwarrants, they make the affirmative stay on their toes. I also don't care if the affirmative presents a policy option or plan, but they better be ready to accept the appropriate attacks from the negative. If the affirmative does chose to present a plan, I am perfectly willing to hear a counterplan that meets the standard burdens (competitive, nontopical etc.).

STYLE: I don't care how fast you go. I will flow everything except sources, generally speaking. I will of course flow sources if it becomes an issue in the round, but I certainly hope you have better ways to defeat an argument. What this means is, if you are in rebuttals and only say something like "pull the Smith evidence," you had better tell me what the Smith evidence is. I also won't flow what I can't understand (obviously). I will let good logic defeat mediocre evidence. This does NOT mean that a team only needs to get up and point out that the evidence isn't that great. I want a valid and sound argument formed as to why it shouldn't be accepted. I appreciate good logic and analysis, so if you hit a case that you have no evidence on, don't dispair; you can still win if you keep your head. I also appreciate the use of humor, especially in an intense round.

Charles Wilbanks
University of South Carolina

Six years judging CEDA debate; 30-40 rounds on this topic

I view a debate judge largely as a mediator with an obligation to pedagogy. I follow a judicial paradigm. That is I do not automatically assign presumption in the round, but rather look at both positions separately and then determine which is most reasonable given whatever criteria might be offered during the round. Because of that, criteria issues or decision rule arguments are primary issues--I determine those before I decide anything else. All arguments, to have voting issue status, must have clear and significant impacts within the criteria.

Of course, I do expect that the affirmative must certain prima facie burdens. Because I stress criteria issues in decision-making and because many times definitions lead to criteria determinations, I prefer definitions to be provided in 1AC. It is OK for these definitions to be contextual rather than from dictionaries but I prefer for them to be stated specifically rather than implied. I believe that the affirmative only has to be reasonable in its interpretation of the proposition. I will, however listen to other definitional standards and I will buy them if there is inadequate rejoinder.

Counterwarrants are fine. Presumption does not automatically go to either team, it must be argued. Counter-intuitive arguments are perfectly acceptable. However, I place presumption against counter-intuitive arguments. In other words, whoever presents them must win them handily in order for me to base a decision on them.

Evidence could be crucial in my decision. Complete cites should be read the first time the source is introduced into the round but are unnecessary afterward. I rarely read evidence after the round. I expect the evidence to be presented in a manner in which I can understand it. If it isn't I just don't consider it. If two pieces of evidence conflict I will usually go with the evidence that is more "on point." If neither is "on point" then I don't consider evidence as much as other considerations. Evidence on debate theory is fine.

CX <u>should</u> be extremely important in a debate. Unfortunately, most debaters waste it and it rarely figures into my decisions in any way. That is not the way I think it should be, but I think that's the way it is. Delivery is not a real important concern in my decisions. Unnecessary speed is not good, but as long as we have time limits on speakers and as long as we debate propositions of substance I believe that debaters will speak faster than "normal" people. Anyway, a bad argument is not a better argument just because it is delivered slowly.

CAL POLY

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
Department of Speech Communication
(805) 546-1431

Name: T. C. Winebrenner
School: Cal Poly, SLO
Years judging: 16 Rounds judged on this topic: 20

1. Paradigm. My judging can be loosely described as neo-interventionist -- while I concede to the convention of setting aside my predispositions about the resolution and its substantive issues, I cannot subscribe to the tabla rasa notion which would have set aside my rationality and pedagogy as well. Contrarily, I insist that arguments advanced in a debate meet the prima facie burden of being reasonable at first glance. It is the responsibility of any debater who makes a claim to provide proofs sufficient to suggest that the claim is probably true, at which time the burden is shifted to the opposition. I would prefer that metadebate be avoided, but when unavoidable, I assume that the issues will be resolved by looking at the reasons behind debate conventions rather than from listening to the opinions of coaches who have neither greater nor lesser authority than I.

2. Affirmative. I presume that affirmative teams will take the opportunity to clearly define the important variables of the proposition (interpretation), establish a perspective which gives meaning to the issues of the proposition (criteria), and make statements which, within that perspective, help to resolve the dispute inherent in the proposition (substantive contentions). I tend to resolve topicality disputes by viewing "reasonable definitions" as satisfactory until given good reason to believe otherwise. While I do not ordinarily subscribe to the "better definition" view of the topicality issue, I do recognize that reasonability is a subjective term and thus open to intelligent discussion.

3. Negative. I presume that negative teams will take the opportunity to clash with the arguments presented by the affirmative. While I must occasionally vote for strategies which by design avoid clash (counter warrants, etc.), I do so under protest. Negatives should attempt to convince me that affirmative arguments intended to prove the truth of the proposition are unsound.

4. Evidence. Quoted materials are not the sole means of making claims attractive, but they are a primary means. I expect debaters to recognize that quoted materials are presented as arguments by authority, and thus the credibility of those authorities is important to resolving disputes. Since credibility serves as the warrant for such arguments, I expect debaters who introduce sources to qualify them (which may be accomplished by brief sign, e.g., professional position -- "professor of government at Harvard," editorial reputation of the publisher -- "Washington Post," or the circumstances of the testimony -- "before the House Ways and Means Committee"). Qualified sources may be impeached, but the burden of proof rests with the plaintiff. I choose to read evidence only when an issue can be resolved in no other manner, in which case I register my disapproval with the speaker points I award to the offending parties.

5. Style and Delivery. Presentation skills affect my judgment by influencing how much and how accurately I am able to process the arguments in the round. I am unimpressed, and occasionally bewildered, by excessive speed. However, I have never viewed debate as an oratory contest. Sound presentation skills are the means of debate rather than its end.

Mark Woolsey
Rounds 30

When a debate team enters a round they are entitled to a critic who is unbiased toward the subject being discussed as well as a judge who is interested in and attentive to the debate.

Topicality I will vote on topicalityonly if the negative establishes a reasonable standard, and proves a specfic violation by the affirmative.

Critera A voting issue,it is a prima facia duty for the Affirmative to establish a critera for the round.

Cross- application Dont expect me to do it.

Delivery Rate of delivery is not an issue as long as the speaker can establish an effective style.